THE STRUCTURE OF DEUTERO - ISAIAH

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
Yale University

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Roy Frank Melugin, Jr.

1968

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this dissertation is to discover whether Deutero-Isaiah is a planned literary continuity or a collection of originally separate poems which can be isolated by form critical analysis. Both positions have been articulated by scholars, but without taking adequate account of the best arguments of the opposing side.

The success of form critical methodology for most pre-exilic prophets suggests that this method should be explored first. The lack of agreement among form critical analysts of Deutero-Isaiah necessitates a fresh form critical analysis. In this dissertation three major Gattungen are discussed: disputation speeches, trial speeches, and speeches of salvation. Form critical analysis of these three Gattungen confirms the view that Deutero-Isaiah is composed of a collection of originally separate units which can be isolated by form. In most instances, however, the form has been created by Deutero-Isaiah instead of reflecting the form of a Gattung with a long history in Israel's oral tradition.

Having concluded that Deutero-Isaiah is a collection of individual units which only occasionally display continuity in message with the surrounding context, the focus of attention shifts from form critical analysis to an examination of the collector's methods. The collector organized Isaiah 40-55 carefully. A prologue (40:1-11) and epilogue (55:6-13) reflect the structure of the collection as a whole. Three large blocks constitute the collection: the Jacob-Israel block (40:12-48:21), the Zion-Jerusalem section (49:14-52:12), and the block organized around the theme of the covenant (chapters 54-55). Each of these blocks is organized on the basis of theme, imagery, and catchword. Although continuity in message between units occurs at isolated points, it does not serve as a criterion for the organization of the entire collection. Thus the structure of the collection reflects a conscious plan of three major blocks, but not a continuous progression in message.

To my wife

Sylvia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was initiated in 1965 at the suggestion of Professor Brevard S. Childs of Yale University, and it is to him that I owe a debt of gratitude. Under his kind and patient criticism I learned the discipline of form critical scholarship, and his suggestions have improved this dissertation at many points.

I am indebted also to my former student colleagues J. W. Whedbee and Burke Long for conversing with me about this topic on many occasions. I am also grateful for the criticisms offered by my friend John van Seters.

For the typing of this manuscript credit goes to Mrs. Virginia Murphey of Sherman, Texas. Her keen eye aided in the correction of errors in the manuscript.

Last but not least, I am grateful for the encouragement supplied to me by my wife and for her patience in foregoing many evenings together so that this project could be completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Disputation Speeches 18
  A. Critique of Previous Scholarship 18
  B. Form in Relation to Context 26
    1. 40:12-31 26
    2. 46:5-11 40
    3. 45:9-13 48
    4. 44:24-28 55
    5. 48:1-11 61
    6. 42:18-25 67
  C. Summary 71

III. Trial Speeches 73
  A. The Trial Between Yahweh and Israel 75
    1. Critique of Previous Scholarship 75
    2. Form in Relation to Context 83
      a. 43:22-28 83
      b. 50:1-3 88
  B. The Trial Between Yahweh and the Nations 98
    1. Form and *Sitz*: Critique of Scholarship 98
    2. Form and *Sitz*: A Constructive Quest 107
    3. Form in Relation to Context 118
      a. 43:8-13; 41:21-29; 43:1-7 119
      b. 44:6-8 124
      c. 48:12-15 129
      d. 45:18-21 134
  C. Summary 140

IV. Salvation Speeches and Related Forms 143
  A. Critique of Previous Scholarship 143
  B. Form in Relation to Context 165
    1. 41:8-13, 14-16, 17-20 165
    2. 44:1-5 171
    3. 43:1-7 173
    4. 43:14-15, 16-21 181
    5. 42:14-17 187
    6. 45:14-17 189
    7. 46:1-4 191
    8. 46:12-13 194
    9. 49:14-21, 22-23, 24-26 196
    10. 51:1-3, 4-5, 6, 7-8 200
    11. 51:9-16, 17-23; 52:1-2 205

        12. Chapters 54-55 213
    C. Summary 225
    D. Deutero-Isaiah and Form Criticism: Concluding Remarks 226

V. The Nature of the Collector's Work 228
    A. Analysis of Scholarship 230
    B. Selected Examples of the Collector's Methods. . . . 239
        1. The Framework 239
        2. The Means of Fleshing Out the Framework . . . 247
            a. 40:12-48:21 248
            b. 49:14-52:12 255
            c. Chapters 54-55 257
    C. Concluding Remarks 258

ABBREVIATIONS

Am.	Amos
ATANT	*Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments*
ATD	*Das Alte Testament Deutsch*
BK	*Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament*
BWANT	*Beitraege zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament*
BZAW	*Beihefte zur Zeitschrift fuer die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
Chr.	Chronicles
Est.	Esther
EvTh	*Evangelische Theologie*
Ex.	Exodus
Gn.	Genesis
Hab.	Habakkuk
Hag.	Haggai
HKAT	*Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*
Ho.	Hosea
Is.	Isaiah
Jb.	Job
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
Je.	Jeremiah

Jo.	Joel
Ju.	Judges
KAT	*Kommentar zum Alten Testament*
Lam.	Lamentations
Lv.	Leviticus
LXX	Septuagint
Mal.	Malachi
Mi.	Micah
MT	Massoretic Text
Na.	Nahum
Pr.	Proverbs
Ps.	Psalms
Rom.	Romans
Sam.	Samuel
SAT	*Die Schriften des Alten Testaments*
SBT	*Studies in Biblical Theology*
Sir.	The Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach
WMANT	*Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift fuer die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZThK	*Zeitschrift fuer Theologie und Kirche*
1QIsa	The Isaiah Scroll of St. Mark's Monastery

I. INTRODUCTION

It has been widely accepted among Old Testament scholars that, for the most part, the pre-exilic prophets uttered their message in the form of short, oral pronouncements. At a later time these sayings were collected and arranged, resulting finally in the prophetic books as we now have them. A process of transmission such as this rules out long sections of continuity in the prophet's message. Instead, we have collections of sayings in which the progression of thought usually does not extend beyond the few verses originally uttered by the prophet.

The isolation of these originally separate units is often relatively easy. Sometimes a change in the historical period informs us that we have more than one unit.[1] In other cases we can separate speeches uttered in the same historical period by distinguishing the particular sets of circumstances in which the prophet spoke his message. A new unit may be marked by a change in the person(s) to whom the prophet speaks.[2] Or a fresh utterance may be indicated by an obvious change in the type of situation faced by the prophet, such as the difference between the circumstance producing argumentative speech and the one in which the oracle was spoken.[3] Still another means of isolating original utterances is the analysis of form. A speech which exhibits a stereotyped structure may be identified as a particular type of utterance (Gattung), whose form has been shaped by continual usage in a certain kind of institution or set of circumstances (Sitz im Leben). When such community-molded speech-forms are discovered in prophetic literature, we may isolate them from one another as types of utterances whose different places of usage in life prevent their having been spoken together originally.[4]

---

[1] For example, Isaiah 14:24-27 must be separated from the preceding context because Assyria, rather than Babylon, is the subject under discussion.

[2] Amos 4:1-3 is directed to wealthy women in Samaria; vv. 4-5 are intended for a masculine plural audience.

This consensus among scholars regarding the pre-exilic prophets does not hold, however, for Deutero-Isaiah. It remains an unsettled question whether Isaiah 40 ff. is a collection of originally separate sayings or a planned literary continuity. This state of uncertainty owes its existence in part, if not entirely, to the difficulty of applying the usual tests for separating units. Because all of Isaiah 40-55 appears to reflect only the period of the end of the exile, it is impossible to isolate speeches by showing that different periods of history are mirrored. The lack of standard prophetic speech-forms, such as the oracle of doom with its invective and announcement of coming disaster, compounds the difficulty and raises the possibility that Deutero-Isaiah may not be a collection of originally separate speeches. Having raised this possibility proves nothing, however. One must produce evidence to show whether or not Deutero-Isaiah continued the prophetic practice of uttering short speeches. We do not lack attempts on both sides in the history of research, but this effort has not produced a consensus. Scholars still disagree sharply whether Deutero-Isaiah is a collection of originally separate speeches or a planned literary composition.

---

[3] Isaiah 28:23-29 is the prophet's attempt to dispute the contention that his word is not from God; 29:1ff. is an oracle.

[4] Amos 8:4-8, for example, betrays the typical form of the prophetic oracle of doom. The summons to hear, the catalogue of transgressions (Scheltrede), and the announcement of coming disaster (Drohwort) exhibit a pattern so stereotyped that vv. 4-8 stand out from the context as a separate unit.

The recent debate over the nature of the literary product in Deutero-Isaiah is the result of the attempt to apply form critical methodology to this prophet of the exile. The first form critical analysis of Deutero-Isaiah's utterances was performed in 1914 by Hugo Gressmann.[5] Following the approach of his generation of form critics with regard to prophetic literature,[6] Gressmann viewed Deutero-Isaiah as a group of originally separate speeches which were collected at a later time.[7] He began with opening and closing formulae as a means of separating speeches from one another. Since these formulae are often lacking, he attempted the isolation of speeches from their context by demonstrating that they exhibit the stereotyped formal elements of various types of utterances used in particular Israelite institutions. In some cases, Gressmann believed, Deutero-Isaiah used traditional prophetic _Gattungen_--promises (_Verheissungen_), threats (_Drohungen_), invectives (_Scheltworte_), exhortations (_Mahnworte_), etc. In other instances non-prophetic _Gattungen_ were employed--particularly the hymn.

---

[5] Gressmann, "Die literarische Analyse Deuterojesajas," ZAW 34 (1914), pp. 254-297.

[6] Note, for example, the article by Hermann Gunkel entitled, "Propheten Israels seit Amos," in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 2nd. ed., Ed. Hermann Gunkel and Leopold Zscharnack, Vol. IV (Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1930), pp. 1538-1554.

In Gressmann's view Deutero-Isaiah transformed the traditional _Gattungen_ to a considerable extent.[8] The hymn is fused with originally non-hymnic elements, such as the prophetic formula, "Thus says Yahweh." Moreover, Deutero-Isaiah's use of the traditional prophetic invectives and exhortations differs from his prophetic predecessors. These prophets had customarily associated the invective with the threat and the exhortation with the promise. But in Deutero-Isaiah this practice was abandoned. Therefore, in Gressmann's opinion, Deutero-Isaiah lived in a period in which the traditional _Gattungen_ were loosed from their moorings and in a state of flux. In these circumstances Deutero-Isaiah was free to imitate and transform them.

---

[7] Gressmann, _op. cit._, p. 264.

[8] _Ibid._, pp. 295ff.

Ludwig Koehler also viewed Deutero-Isaiah as a collection of originally separate utterances.[9] Moreover, they are literary modifications of oral speech-forms. The Gattungen which Koehler isolates are different from those of Gressmann. Koehler's primary Gattungen are the theophany (Theophanie), the messenger speech (Botenspruch), and the disputation (Streitgespraech). In Koehler's opinion Deutero-Isaiah's literary creativity is so far-reaching that these Gattungen can be seen only as the primitive material upon which the prophet performed his craft. For example, in Deutero-Isaiah's use of the messenger speech, the Gattung has been modified to the extent that Deutero-Isaiah no longer speaks as a prophet, but like a prophet.[10] Indeed, considerable fusion of speech-forms may be detected. For instance, 41:25-29, a messenger speech,[11] contains an element from disputation speech (vv. 26, 29).[12]

Gressmann and Koehler were content to argue that Deutero-Isaiah consists of originally separate units. They showed no interest in the arrangement of the collection. Sigmund Mowinckel, who also believed that the Deutero-Isaianic complex is a collection of originally separate speeches, advanced beyond his predecessors in an attempt to discover the collector's methods.[13] He argued that the collector arranged speeches by means of thematic similarity and catchword connection. Each speech is arranged in its context on the basis of its association with the preceding speech.[14] Such a process of collection, it must be observed, is mechanical. There is no progression of thought involved in the juxtaposition of units. Thus, in Mowinckel's view, the arrangement of the texts is not significant fcr understanding the prophet's message.

---

[9] Koehler, Deuterojesaja stilkritisch untersucht (Giessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1923), pp. 102ff.

[10] Ibid., p. 104.

[11] Ibid., p. 107.

[12] Ibid., p. 114.

The hypothesis of Mowinckel sparked a lively response from Karl Elliger.[15] Although he agreed that Deutero-Isaiah is a collection of originally separate utterances, he believed that the arrangement of the texts is theologically significant. Deutero-Isaiah's disciple Trito-Isaiah, Elliger argued, arranged his master's speeches in such a way that there is continuity in thought between them.[16] In some cases it was necessary for Trito-Isaiah to rework the speeches of his predecessor, or even to insert speeches of his own.[17] The result of this process of collection, as Elliger saw it, was a group of message units, most of which included more than one formal unit.[18] Such units of meaning, whether they include one Gattung or a sequence of several Gattungen, we shall call kerygmatic units.

---

[13] Mowinckel, "Die Komposition des deuterojesajanischen Buches," ZAW 49 (1931), pp. 87-112, 242-260.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 242.

[15] *Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhaeltnis zu Tritojesaja* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933), pp. 219-272.

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 220-225.

The differences between Mowinckel and Elliger are, of course, significant. But these disagreements cannot be assessed until the more basic question regarding the kind of literature contained in Deutero-Isaiah is resolved. The differences between Gressmann and Koehler, as well as between Mowinckel and Elliger, in the isolation and labeling of Gattungen provoke doubts whether Deutero-Isaiah is composed of utterances in which oral Gattungen are imitated. Still, it is possible that the differences between these form critics are not rooted in the bankruptcy of the form critical method for Deutero-Isaiah but rather in the inadequate use of that approach.

Whatever the truth may be regarding the viability of form critical methodology for Deutero-Isaiah, we must begin our work with the recognition that the form critical work of the scholars discussed above is somewhat superficial. Gressmann did not undertake a detailed scrutiny of the forms of Deutero-Isaiah's speeches. For the most part, he simply adopted the Gattungen which had already been discovered by form critical research.[19] Since Deutero-Isaiah's speeches appear to deviate from these Gattungen to a certain extent, he merely assumed that the prophet had modified the Gattung in question. Apparently it did not occur to him to seek new Gattungen. Mowinckel also exhibits very little true examination of form. For example, his arguments for the original unity of 40:12-31 are not based on a careful analysis of the structure and Sitz im Leben of the speech,[20] and this is characteristic of his work. A similar lack of attention to structure and Sitz im Leben is characteristic of Elliger.[21] In the case of Koehler, numerous utterances are included under the Gattung of the messenger speech, but the author does not present a thorough analysis of the way in which Deutero-Isaiah used and modified the structure of this Gattung. He contents himself with presenting a list of messenger speeches, distinguishing only the presence or absence of introductory or closing formula.[22] A discussion of the internal structure of the speech is conspicuously missing. His discussion of the disputation Gattung is equally sketchy.[23] His lack of attention to the structure of the theophany form makes us wonder whether a Gattung with an identifiable form has been discovered.[24]

---

[17] The bulk of Elliger's book (pp. 1-218) presents the argument that Trito-Isaiah's work can be detected in chapters 40-55.

[18] Beginning on p. 225 Elliger undertakes a systematic examination of the relationship of each unit to its context.

---

[19] For example, Gressmann employs several of the Gattungen discussed by Gunkel, such as Drohungen and Scheltworte. Cf. Gunkel, op. cit.

[20] Mowinckel, op. cit., p. 90, footnote 2.

[21] If one examines Elliger's analysis of chapter 41 (op. cit., pp. 229ff.), for instance, one looks in vain for precise information concerning formal structures and their Sitz im Leben. Instead, such criteria as content, poetic meter, and strophe are used to separate units.

Joachim Begrich was the first form critic to push beyond such a rough-hewn approach.[25] Aware of the disagreements among his predecessors, Begrich undertook a fresh analysis--this time a minute examination of the form and Sitz im Leben of each Gattung. This resulted in conclusions markedly different from those of his predecessors. For example, Begrich was not content with the general category of the promise (Verheissung) as a description of Deutero-Isaiah's assurances concerning the future. Careful analysis led him to understand Deutero-Isaiah's assurances as imitations of a salvation oracle Gattung used by priests in answer to the lament psalm.[26] In similar fashion detailed inquiry prompted him to distinguish trial speeches from disputation speeches.[27] The former he identified as imitations of speech-forms customarily employed in the legal proceedings of the town gate.[28]

---

[22] Koehler, op. cit., pp. 102-111.

[23] For Koehler's discussion of Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches see pp. 111-120.

[24] Koehler discusses the theophany on pp. 124-127.

[25] Begrich, "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel," ZAW 52 (1934), pp. 81-92, and Studien zu Deuterojesaja, BWANT, 4 Folge, Heft 25 (77) (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938).

[26] Begrich, "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel," pp. 81-92, and Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 6-18.

Like Gressmann and Koehler, Begrich believed that Deutero-Isaiah's speeches are literary imitations of oral Gattungen.[29] The circumstances of the exile, Begrich believed, prevented oral preaching. Besides, the fact that Deutero-Isaiah's speech-forms were customarily used by priests in the cult, by parties before the court assembled in the gate, etc., rather than by prophets, means that their use by a prophet must be understood as imitative activity. Nevertheless, Begrich's concurrence with Gressmann and Koehler that Deutero-Isaiah's speech-forms are imitations must not be construed to imply that Begrich agreed with Gressmann that Deutero-Isaiah represents the breakdown of traditional Gattungen.[30] On the contrary, Begrich's delineation of the Gattungen makes Deutero-Isaiah's imitation of them appear surprisingly exact. The difficulty with the previous form critics, from Begrich's point of view, is that they had not identified the Gattungen correctly.

---

[27] Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 41.

[28] Ibid., pp. 18-41.

[29] Ibid., p. 93.

[30] In fact, Begrich denies that traditional prophetic Gattungen are prominent in Deutero-Isaiah. See Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 61.

Eberhard von Waldow[31] followed the general lines of Begrich's form critical analysis. He departed from Begrich, however, in his assumption that the prophet's words were delivered orally. Moreover, in von Waldow's opinion, certain Gattungen employed by Deutero-Isaiah are not imitations. The salvation oracle is not a priestly Gattung. It is instead a type of speech used by prophets in the cult, and Deutero-Isaiah was a cultic prophet.[32] The disputation speech, too, is a genuine rather than an imitated Gattung,[33] and the trial speech comes, not from the town gate, but from the sphere of the cult.[34]

The "literary-critical" approach, which generally prevailed before the advent of form criticism, had continued in some quarters as a means of interpreting Deutero-Isaiah. For example, Charles Cutler Torrey, ignoring the results of the form critics, asserted that the prophet's poems (chapters 34-35, 40-66) were issued "at one time and in one volume, not as separate poems or groups of poems which were afterward collected."[35] They show that an original order has been preserved. Each poem is complete as far as literary form is concerned. The order of arrangement is not a logical pattern, for hardly ever does a poem take account of the one immediately preceding. Poems are instead arranged according to artistic effectiveness.

---

[31] Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rheinischen Friedrich Wilhelms-Universitaet at Bonn, 1953).

[32] Ibid., pp. 26, 124-133.

[33] Ibid., pp. 35-36.

[34] Ibid., pp. 37-47.

[35] Torrey, The Second Isaiah (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), pp. 92ff.

Few would disagree with Torrey that similarity in imagery and theme is a factor in the arrangement of the material. Undoubtedly it was his literary sensitivity to these similarities which led him to ignore the atomistic approach of Gressmann and Koehler. But the subsequent work of Mowinckel and Elliger regarding the collector's methods raises the possibility that Torrey may have dismissed all too easily the idea that the arrangement of the material is the work of a collector.

For a self-conscious dialogue on the issues between form critics and those who view Deutero-Isaiah as a planned literary composition we turn to the work of Sidney Smith.[36] Concentrating on Gressmann, Smith charges that content, not form, is the basis for labeling Gattungen. Besides, says Smith, Gressmann himself admitted that with Deutero-Isaiah the disintegration of speech-forms is apparent. Furthermore, for Smith, the inability of Gressmann's form critical successors to agree among themselves hardly inspires confidence in their conclusions. The reason for the form critics' lack of success, Smith argues, is that Deutero-Isaiah is not composed of speech-forms stamped by long usage in oral tradition. We have instead a group of carefully-written speeches, some of which are short and others of which are quite extensive. Perhaps, Smith speculates, they were carried from place to place by the messengers mentioned in the text.

---

[36] Smith, Isaiah Chapters XL-LV: Literary Criticism and History (New York: Oxford University Press, 1940, 1944), pp. 6ff.

Smith's critique of the form critics is picked up and developed further by James Muilenburg.[37] For Muilenburg, it is undeniable that the pre-exilic prophets spoke in short utterances which can be isolated by form. But in the seventh century a literary revolution took place in Israel--perhaps in the entire Near East--in which the ancient oral patterns disintegrated and gave way to longer units made up of a fusion of Gattungen. This change is visible, according to Muilenburg, in Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and Deutero-Isaiah. Deutero-Isaiah makes use of oral speech-forms, to be sure, but they are not in any way binding on the form of his literary product. He combines them with other Gattungen and snippets of Gattungen, molding and transforming them in ways to suit his purposes.[38] Although remnants of traditional speech-forms are observable here and there, they are not the basis for separating units. Deutero-Isaiah has instead constructed his poems by means of strophes.[39] The strophes are literary subdivisions within a larger unit. They can be isolated by an examination of style. A strophe, for example, often begins with the emphatic personal pronoun, exclamations like "behold," a call to hear in imperative style, etc. Strophes are often linked by similar introductions, conclusions, or key words.[40]

---

[37] The Interpreter's Bible, Ed., George Arthur Buttrick, Vol. V (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), pp. 381ff.

[38] Ibid., pp. 385, 389-390.

[39] Ibid., p. 385.

Muilenburg also sees a kind of progression in the prophet's thought. Admittedly it is not the kind of continuity habitually expected in Western literature, for verses and strophes break in without any apparent relation to the context. Nevertheless, a rough progression is observable. Chapters 40-55 open with the announcement in the heavenly council that God is about to appear, coming as a conqueror of Israel's enemies to bring about his kingdom and as a shepherd to comfort and heal. Then follows a poem on Yahweh as Creator. After that, the nations are encountered in a trial with Yahweh. In this trial Yahweh calls Israel his Servant. The Servant, although called to a high destiny, is blind and deaf. Yahweh, however, is gracious and promises redemption. Cyrus is then named as the conqueror of Babylon, and the conquest of Babylon follows. At that time the Servant enters, calling on the nations to hear, and the promise of redemption is continued. The climax comes with the coming of the King and the cry, "Yahweh has become king!" This is followed by the announcement of the exaltation of the Servant, after which appears the nations' confession and Yahweh's repeated vindication of the Servant. Chapters 40-55 close with a final cry of joy.[41]

---

[40] Ibid., pp. 391-393.

The darts which Smith and Muilenburg aim at the form critics have not totally missed their target. Their use of Gressmann's admission of the disintegration of traditional oral patterns is a significant blow against Gressmann's assumption that these crumbling speech-forms can be used for isolating units. The disagreements among subsequent form critics only reinforces their assault. Unfortunately for Smith and Muilenburg, however, their almost exclusive attention to the men who preceded Begrich blunts the force of their thrust. As we have seen, Begrich's minute analysis constitutes an advance upon his predecessors. Therefore, the charge of Smith and Muilenburg that form criticism has resulted only in "changing the labels" does not take proper cognizance of the particular importance of Begrich's work. Without a serious testing of Begrich's conclusions--a task not undertaken by Smith and Muilenburg--the arguments of these two English-speaking scholars cannot be adopted. Besides, it is questionable whether Muilenburg's so-called "literary revolution" does away with the heavy impact of Gattungen during the seventh century. The research of Walther Zimmerli on Ezekiel--one of Muilenburg's examples of the literary revolution--has shown that traditional forms of speech are constitutive for understanding the nature of that prophet's literary product.[42]

---

[41] Ibid., pp. 385-386.

[42] For an illustration of Zimmerli's approach see "Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel," ZAW 66 (1954), pp. 1-26.

The work of Muilenburg provided the impetus for Claus Westermann to enter the discussion.[43] Although Westermann was influenced to a certain extent by the conclusions of Eva Hessler[44] regarding the overall structure of Deutero-Isaiah, he enters the arena of debate by means of a dialogue with Muilenburg.[45] Westermann agrees with Muilenburg that Deutero-Isaiah is composed for the most part of units longer than the form critics had believed. Moreover, these longer units do not manifest any one Gattung. But he disagrees with Muilenburg regarding the role that traditional Gattungen play. For Westermann, oral speech-forms customarily employed in various circles are constitutive in the formation of units. The long poetic units composed by the prophet are a complex interweaving of elements of various Gattungen with one Gattung usually serving as the model by which the fusion of various speech-form elements takes place. For example, in 49:14-26 elements of disputation speech and the announcement of salvation (Ankuendigung) are arranged in accordance with the structure of the lament psalm. This long unit of meaning--a kerygmatic unit--is an original poem which cannot be described by any one Gattung. At the same time its structure cannot be understood apart from form critical analysis.[46]

---

[43] Westermann has made three contributions to the study of Deutero-Isaiah: "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," EvTh 24 (1964), pp. 355-373; Sprache und Struktur der Prophetie Deuterojesajas, in Forschung am alten Testament, Theologische Buecherei, Band 24 (Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1964), pp. 92-170; Das Buch Jesaja: Kapitel 40-66, ATD, Teilband 19 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966).

[44] Gott der Schoepfer: Ein Beitrag zur Komposition und Theologie Deuterojesajas (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ernst Moritz Arndt-Universitaet at Greifswald, 1961).

[45] Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, pp. 106-110.

Westermann's Gattung which serves as the model for the long poem would result in a more controlled method of distinguishing between major breaks and minor transitions than the approach of Muilenburg. But is Westermann correct in his view of Deutero-Isaiah's fusion of forms? Has he succeeded in toppling Begrich's view of independent formal units?

A new quest for the nature of the Deutero-Isaianic literature must begin with Begrich and his successors. We begin with a reappraisal of form critical methodology partly because one might expect Deutero-Isaiah to continue the practice of his pre-exilic predecessors. But the failure of Smith and Muilenburg to come to terms with Begrich is the most important reason for re-examining the work of Begrich and his successors. Only after the nature of the literary units has been determined can we discuss the question of the overall structure of the Deutero-Isaianic corpus.

---

[46] Westermann, "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," pp. 366-368; Sprache und Struktur, p. 121; Das Buch Jesaja, pp. 175-180.

II. DISPUTATION SPEECHES

A. CRITIQUE OF PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP

The efforts of form critical research to determine the nature of Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches have not yielded solid results. To be sure, all parties have agreed that the function of speeches of this Gattung is to persuade others to accept the view of the speaker. But in spite of the fact that both major studies since Begrich[1] adhere for the most part to the latter's form critical labels for each speech, disagreement exists with regard to the way these Gattungen are manifested in the Deutero-Isaianic corpus. Does Deutero-Isaiah's employment of speech-forms reflect the original function of these forms in their true Sitz im Leben? Or does he imitate forms whose place in life is somewhat different from the one in which our prophet employs them? Are Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches independent units with no essential connection with the context? Or does he employ speech-forms as small segments of a larger kerygmatic whole?[2]

---

[1] E. von Waldow, Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rheinischen Friedrich Wilhelms-Universitaet at Bonn, 1953); C. Westermann, Sprache und Struktur der Prophetie Deuterojesajas, in Forschung am alten Testament, Theologische Buecherei, Band 24 (Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1964), pp. 92-170.

[2] By "kerygmatic whole" I mean a segment of speech which cannot be separated without injuring the message unit as it was originally composed or without destroying an irreducible message unit which was artificially created by a collector or reworker of prophetic texts.

Begrich views Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches as the prophet's imitation of speech-forms used in everyday situations of dispute.[3] One reason for this view is his belief that the circumstances of the exile made oral preaching impossible.[4] His view that Deutero-Isaiah did not dispute with opponents face-to-face means that his disputation speeches are literary imitations of speech-forms occurring in real life. But Begrich sees these speeches as imitations for another important reason. For him the forms of disputation speech have their true Sitz im Leben in the everyday world, and the prophets consciously imitated these non-prophetic disputation speech-forms,[5] much as they sometimes imitated the priestly torah.[6] From the variety of possibilities in everyday life to develop the forms of disputation speech, one can see how the prophets' imitation would reflect that variety.

Begrich does not attempt to prove his assumption that Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches are imitations, but it is not difficult to see how it could be done on the basis of his approach. The variety in

---

[3] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, BWANT, 4 Folge, Heft 25 (77) (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), p. 42.

[4] Ibid., p. 93.

[5] Ibid., p. 42.

[6] Cf. Begrich, "Die priesterliche Tora," BZAW 66 (Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann, 1936), pp. 63-88.

Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches could not be accounted for if they had their Sitz im Leben in one institution; therefore, they must be imitations of speeches used in various settings in the everyday world. Moreover, the adaptation of cultic hymn-forms to the circumstances of disputation could not be explained as a phenomenon native to prophetic circles in general, but rather must be understood as an arbitrary fusion of two Gattungen which have different life settings.

Von Waldow too recognizes the various ways in which Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches are structured.[7] Moreover, he agrees that the lack of a common formal structure in any group of speeches reflecting a particular Gattung would signify the presence of an imitation no longer moored to the original Sitz im Leben.[8] But von Waldow denies the lack of such a formal structure in Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches. In spite of the admitted variety in structure, one common formal framework exists. The need to convince opponent(s) of the truth of the speaker's claim provides the framework for the form. It consists of A: disputation basis, which provides a point of departure upon which both speaker and opponent can agree, and B: conclusion, which is the logical result of the argument based on the point of common agreement.[9] This formal framework which always appears, in spite of the structural variety, demonstrates, as far as von Waldow is concerned, that the prophet is using a speech-form whose true Sitz im Leben is the situation of the prophet's use of it--the prophet's defense of oracles which he had uttered in the cult.[10] Both von Waldow and Begrich see Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches as originally separate speech units.

---

[7] von Waldow, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 28ff.

The position of Westermann[11] is still another approach. Contrary to the view of von Waldow, he believes that the variety in structure will not yield one form.[12] Moreover, these disputation speeches are removed from their original Sitz im Leben. Whereas the earlier prophets were aware that disputation speech was not genuinely prophetic and used it only occasionally,[13] by Deutero-Isaiah's time it had assumed an important role in the prophet's message.[14] Indeed, speaking form critically, it sometimes appears in inseparable connection with the salvation oracle Gattung.[15] Such a transformation means that the old disputation forms have been so far removed from their original Sitz im Leben that they can be combined easily with other speech-forms.

---

[10] Ibid., pp. 135ff.

[11] Westermann, op. cit., pp. 124-134.

[12] Ibid., p. 125.

[13] And, we may add, often without modification in form. The rhetorical-question disputation form found in Am. 3:3-8 displays essentially untouched the form and content of the kind of Wisdom disputation seen in Jb. 6:5-6; 8:11ff.

[14] Westermann, op. cit., pp. 125-126.

[15] Ibid., pp. 126-127.

Another indication that Westermann views these speeches as imitations[16] no longer rooted in their original setting is his belief that they are employed in lengthy poetic compositions rather than existing as separate utterances. Although disputation speech forms are imitated, we have to do with conscious compositions which elaborate upon and transform the original Gattung. Isaiah 40:12-31, in Westermann's estimation, is a good example of one of these compositions.[17] It is composed of one complete disputation speech (vv. 27-31), which is preceded by three disputation-speech fragments (vv. 12-17, 18-24, 25-26). These parts are all related to one another as a unified attempt to deal with one matter of dispute,[18] Israel's complaint that Yahweh has forsaken her (v.27). Vv. 28-31 dispute the contention that Yahweh will not help, while the three fragments in vv. 12-31 counter the assertion that Yahweh can not help. This long poetic composition which imitates disputation speech draws its content from the style of the cultic hymn. It is from the hymn that the structure

---

[16] Westermann does not employ this term, but it is consistent with his position to use it.

[17] Westermann, op. cit., pp. 127-132.

[18] Westermann views the questions in vv. 12-26 as rhetorical rather than real issues under dispute.

"God can help/God will help" is derived.[19] Thus we have a speech which imitates both disputation style and hymnic style in a complex way, which to Westermann is indicative of a planned composition.

A full-scale critique of these men would demand a detailed analysis of each speech. Such an analysis will appear later on, but now a few observations in dialogue with the scholars just reviewed will set the framework for a more complete examination.

It is necessary, I believe, to view Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches as imitations. Even von Waldow's disputation basis-conclusion schema does not succeed in presenting us with one speech-form. A glance at 45:9-13, for example, shows us that this simple schema does not fit. If vv. 9-10 should be viewed as the common basis for disputation, v.11 would be the conclusion, demonstrating that Israel cannot rightfully question Yahweh's plan. But what is to be done with vv. 12-13? The basis (v. 12) and conclusion (v. 13) seem to be presented again, this time in hymnic style. We must conclude that disputation basis-conclusion is not a simple formal framework with particular roots in Deutero-Isaiah's preaching. Instead this schema can be applied in broad outline to any disputation which argues from a point of agreement to a logical conclusion. The fact that there are many forms which exhibit these two parts of a disputation is a sign that disputation basis and conclusion are not

---

[19] Cf. Westermann, Das Loben Gottes in den Psalmen, 3rd. ed. (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963), pp. 91ff.

formal markers, but merely broad categories that roughly describe every disputation speech.

The inadequacy of von Waldow's attempt to discover a common formal framework suggests that we should not speak of *one Gattung* with *one Sitz im Leben.* Indeed, several forms of disputation speech apparently occur.[20] But even more significant is the fusion of *Gattungen*. Formal elements from the cult are often incorporated within the framework of the disputation,[21] and in one case oracular formulae and the self-praise style of the hymn are fused with disputation speech (45:9-13).[22] This fusion can have its origin only in the creativity of Deutero-Isaiah. Moreover, Deutero-Isaiah's habit of putting disputation speech in the mouth of Yahweh[23] differs from the traditional prophetic practice. This is shown by the rarity of it in the earlier prophets and their tendency to utter disputations as their own words rather than as mouthpieces of Yahweh.[24] This departure from traditional practice, coupled with his fusion of hymnic and disputational style, indicates that Deutero-Isaiah is not fettered to a particular disputation Gattung.

---

[20] 45:9-13 and 40:12-17, for example, betray different forms.

[21] 40:18-24, 25-26, 27-31; 45:9-13; 46:5-11. Note the hymnic style in each of these texts.

[22] כה אמר יהוה and אמר יהוה צבאות frame the disputation speech.

[23] 40:25-26; 45:9-13; 46:5-11; 48:1-11.

[24] Cf. e.g., Am. 3:3-8; Is. 28:23-29 .

The stamp of Deutero-Isaiah's creativity on traditional speech-forms must not lead us to believe that form critical analysis is not helpful in Deutero-Isaianic research. The prophet's freedom to fuse Gattungen does not indicate that he no longer feels attached to them. On the contrary, we find that his disputation speeches function as disputation speeches throughout. The material from other speech-forms is subordinated to the purposes of disputation. In this sense Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches stand out from their context as units which are separable by form critical analysis.

But how are they related to their context? Are they originally isolated and self-contained, as Begrich and von Waldow suppose? Or is Westermann closer to the truth when he sees conscious compositions whose parts are imitations of Gattungen? The thematic continuity of 40:12-31, for example, suggests a meaningful arrangement, but at which level of transmission? Is it an original composition? Or do we have to do with a collector with well-planned theological purposes?

Such questions can be answered only by careful attention to each passage on the one hand and scrutinizing the plan of the entire corpus of Deutero-Isaiah on the other. Since this chapter cannot yet presuppose the results of form critical analysis of the major Gattungen in Deutero-Isaiah, only limited forays into the problem of context can be performed. Nevertheless, because the problem of context is related to the problem of form in Deutero-Isaiah we must not eschew the examination of context even in a chapter devoted primarily to the problem of form. Therefore, in this chapter the immediate context will be examined, and conclusions about context will be drawn to the extent that is justifiable prior to analysis of other *Gattungen*. Only after all of Deutero-Isaiah's major *Gattungen* have been examined can we expand these limited conclusions concerning context into a full-scale analysis of context.

B. FORM IN RELATION TO CONTEXT

1. 40:12-31. Form critical analysis of 40:12-31 has produced little agreement. Gressmann,[25] Haller,[26] and Mowinckel,[27] on the one hand, have considered these verses as a unity. On the other, Koehler,[28] Elliger,[29] Begrich,[30] and von Waldow[31] have viewed them as

---

[25] Gressmann, "Die literarische Analyse Deuterojesajas," *ZAW* 34 (1914), p. 264.

[26] Max Haller, *Das Judentum*, 2nd. ed., revised, *SAT* 2/3 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1925), pp. 25-27.

[27] Sigmund Mowinckel, "Die Komposition des deuterojesajanischen Buches," *ZAW* 49 (1931), p. 90.

[28] Ludwig Koehler, *Deuterojesaja stilkritisch untersucht* (Giessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1923), p. 111.

[29] Karl Elliger, *Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhaeltnis zu Tritojesaja* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933), pp. 225ff.

[30] Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja*, p. 42.

[31] von Waldow, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

a collection of separate speeches. Westermann[32] agrees with the former group that these verses are a unity, but he differs from them by accepting with minor changes Begrich's form critical units as smaller parts of the larger poem.[33] The crucial difference between Begrich and Westermann is whether these verses are a collection of separate speeches or a long poem based on imitation of speech-forms which can be identified by form. This issue can be settled only by re-examining this passage in its constituent parts.

Although there has been unanimity among form critics since Begrich that vv. 12-17 display a particular form to be distinguished from the larger context, the description of that form has differed. Begrich[34] and von Waldow[35] view vv. 12-14 as rhetorical questions which provide the common basis of agreement held between prophet and opponents. For them, vv. 15-17 constitute the conclusion about the disputed matter, for these verses express the goal toward which the disputation has been aimed. The conclusion thus marks the close of the speech. Westermann, however, sees vv. 15-17 as merely an attack in the course of the argument, but not as the conclusion of the speech. Instead, speaking form critically, vv. 12-17 do not represent a complete disputation speech,[36] but only a piece of a longer disputational poem (vv. 12-31) in the praise style of the hymn. Thus vv. 15-17 do not conclude the speech; they are but a part of the continued praise of the Creator.[37] The essence of the disagreement between Begrich and von Waldow on the one hand and Westermann on the other is that the former consider the form of vv. 12-17 as a disputation, while the latter sees the form as a hymn, functioning as a disputation only because of its contextual relationship with vv. 27-31. Neither side, however, produces formal parallels to prove its case.

---

[32] Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, pp. 127-132.

[33] Begrich: vv. 12-17, 18-20+25-26, 21-24, 27-31; Westermann: vv. 12-17, 18-24, 25-26, 27-31.

[34] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 42 f.

[35] von Waldow, op. cit., p. 30.

A fresh examination reveals the following form: (1) A series of rhetorical questions introduced by מי:

> Who measured the waters in the hollow of his hand and marked off the heavens with a span,
> Enclosed the dust of the earth in a measure, weighed the mountains with a balance, and the hills with scales?
> Who measured the spirit of Yahweh, what man taught him his counsel?
> With whom did he consult for his enlightenment,[38] who taught him the path of justice,
> Taught him knowledge, and made him know the way of understanding?

---

[36] Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, p. 129.

[37] Ibid., p. 131.

[38] Literally, "with the result that he enlightened him."

Prophet and opponents agree on the answer to these questions.

(2) Therefore, on the basis of the obvious answer to these questions, the prophet moves to resolve the dispute by means of statements introduced by הן :

> Behold, the nations are like a drop from a bucket, reckoned
> as dust in the scales.
> Behold, the coastlands are taken up[39] like fine dust,
> Lebanon is not sufficient for burning, its beasts for a
> burnt offering.
> All the nations are like nothing compared to him, reckoned
> as nothing and emptiness in relation to him.

Disputations with questions introduced by מי occur elsewhere in the Old Testament. One appears, for instance, in Exodus 4:11 when Yahweh counters Moses' objection to his commission on the grounds that he is a poor orator: "Who put a mouth in man or makes him dumb, or deaf, or seeing, or blind? Is it not I, Yahweh?" On the basis of this conclusion drawn from the rhetorical questions Yahweh can now issue a command to Moses without further objection. Another example of this type of disputation is 2 Kings 18:35 (Is. 36:20). Rabshakeh employs a series of rhetorical questions (vv. 33-35), among which is a question introduced by מי. These questions are intended to convince the people that the demands of the Assyrian king should be accepted instead of listening to Hezekiah. These two texts indicate that rhetorical questions, among which are questions introduced by מי,

---

[39] The active stem is used here in a passive sense.

may be employed in disputation speeches in various ways.

This disputational style has been taken over into Wisdom circles. In Job 38ff. we find a long list of rhetorical questions, some of which are introduced by מי,[40] which dispute Job's ability to call Yahweh into question.[41] Job 40:25ff. is particularly interesting, in that certain conclusions to be drawn from the preceding rhetorical questions are introduced by הן (41:1). Following rhetorical questions concerning the power of a man in relation to the monster Leviathan, Yahweh now begins to resolve the dispute:

> Behold (הן), his hope[42] is false, he is cast down even at the sight of him.[43]
> He is not fierce that he can arouse him.[44] Who is he then that can stand before me?[45]
> Who can stand before me that I must repay? Anything under all the heavens is mine.

---

[40] 38:5, 6, 25, 29, 36, 37, 41; 39:5.

[41] Cf. also Pr. 30:1-4 for another occurrence of the form.

[42] The hope of any would-be assailant.

[43] Even if the text is to be translated, "Were not the gods cast down at the sight of him?", according to the Peshitta and Symmachus, the contrast between a man and Leviathan would still be maintained. For a discussion of the text see Marvin H. Pope, Job, The Anchor Bible, Vol. XV (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1965), p. 282.

[44] Or, "Is he not fierce when one arouses him?"

[45] Most major witnesses, including the LXX and Peshitta, read the first person suffix.

> Did I not silence his boasting[46] and the mighty word
> and ________?[47]

The essence of Job 41:1-4 is that a man who obviously cannot subdue Leviathan cannot call God into question (vv. 2b-3), for did not God subdue that fearful monster (v.4)?

We cannot attempt to settle here the unresolved question whether Job 41:5ff. belonged originally to 40:25-41:4.[48] Our concern here is only to show the existence in Wisdom circles of a disputation Gattung made up of rhetorical questions, which are sometimes resolved by a conclusion introduced by הן.[49] The fact that this form appears both in Job 38ff. and Proverbs 30:1-4 suggests that the wise men have taken over a widely-used Gattung and created a new Sitz im Leben inside their own circles. This suggestion is reinforced by the presence of characteristic Wisdom content. God at creation is contrasted with mere creatures.[50] Moreover, the vocabulary is characteristic of Wisdom circles to show the contrast between God and all other beings.[51]

---

[46] With Pope, op. cit., p. 283.

[47] No satisfactory solution has been offered for וחין ערכו.

[48] Cf. the commentaries.

[49] Jb. 38ff.; Pr. 30:1-4. Cf. E. von Waldow, Der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der prophetischen Gerichtsreden, BZAW 85 (Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann, 1963), pp. 48ff. G. von Rad also supports our notion that we are dealing with a Wisdom Gattung. He points to a parallel in Egyptian Wisdom literature in which the scribe Hori disputes with a colleague in rhetorical question style. Cf. von Rad, "Job XXXVIII and Egyptian Wisdom," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays, trans. by E. W. Trueman Dicken (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), pp. 287ff. The text to which von Rad refers can be found in J. B. Pritchard, ed. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, 2nd. ed. (Princeton, New Jersey; Princeton University Press, 1955), pp. 475ff.

Isaiah 40:12-17 reflects not only the form of this Wisdom Gattung, but also the content, as the vocabulary shows.[52] Thus Isaiah 40:12-17 is cast in the form of a Wisdom disputation rather than the form of a hymn. To be sure, the similarity with the rhetorical questions of hymnic style is not to be overlooked.[53] But the fact that the questions in Isaiah 40:12-17 are disputational rather than elements of praise,[54] coupled with the formal parallels and vocabulary study indicated above, rules out Westermann's view that this is imitation of the hymn of praise.

Now that the form of 40:12-17 has been determined, we must ask whether vv. 18ff. are a continuation of this speech-form. We have already left open the possibility that the disputation in Job 40:25-41:4

---

[50] Cf r. 30:1-4; Jb. 38ff.

[51] עצה - Jb. 38:2; 42:3. בינה - Jb. 28:23; Pr. 30:2. ידע - Jb. 28:13, 23; Pr. 30:3. דעת - Jb. 38:2; 42:3.

[52] Cf. vv. 13-14.

[53] Cf. e.g., Ex. 15:11; Ps. 35:10; 71:19; 77:14; 89:7, 9; 113:5.

[54] In the hymn the rhetorical questions are always elements of praise; never are they attempts to convince doubters.

is continued by vv. 5ff. Is it possible that vv. 18ff. might be similarly related to vv. 12-17?

An examination of vv. 18ff., however, results in the conclusion that they are not related form critically to vv. 12-17. A comparison with 46:5-11 and 40:25-26 demonstrates the independence of vv. 18-24 from vv. 12-17. The form is as follows: (1) the question, "To whom will you compare God?" (40:18). It can appear in divine speech (Is. 40:25; 46:5) as well as in the prophet's own words. (2) Next follows a sarcastic description of idol making (40:19-20).[55] (3) Then appears an appeal for the prophet's hearers to consider the matter for themselves. It may summon the hearers to recall what the cult has taught them, sometimes by means of rhetorical questions,[56] or it may appear in imperative form.[57] (4) The content of what the hearers are to consider is in participial hymnic style.[58]

This speech-form has no real Sitz im Leben, for it is an imitation of disputation speech with an arbitrary fusion made up of a framework from disputation style[59] and content from cultic style.[60] Nevertheless, the fact that it has a certain degree of stability of form within Deutero-Isaiah suggests at least a certain independence from its context. It is a literarily-stylized imitation of a real speech-form. The supposition that it has a certain independence from the context is reinforced by the fact that vv. 18-24 form a rather tightly-knit disputation on the question, "To whom will you compare God?" Westermann views this as a rhetorical question,[61] but this is unlikely. The dispute whether Yahweh is superior to the nations' gods is an issue throughout the first part of Deutero-Isaiah.[62] Furthermore, the prophet's opponents are presented with a picture of the impossibility of real confidence in foreign gods (40:19-20), followed by an appeal to contrast this picture with what they have always known about Yahweh (40:21-24). What purpose does this serve other than to convince objectors that Yahweh is incomparable in a circumstance of real doubt about that very fact?

---

[55] Cf. 46:6-7. 40:25-26 omits this element.

[56] הלוא תדעו, etc. (40:21).

[57] 40:26; 46:8, 9. 46:8 asks the hearers to reflect on the statement concerning idol making. V. 9, by contrast, commands reflection on Israel's tradition. Westermann's elimination of vv. 5-8 on the basis of the difference in the meaning of זכרו does not hold, however, when one compares the formal similarity of 40:18-24, 40:25-26, and 46:5-11. Cf. Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, pp. 151-152.

[58] 40:22-24, 25-26 (third person style); 46:10-11 (self-praise style).

We have sought to show the relative independence of two speech units--vv. 12-17, a Wisdom form with Wisdom content, and vv. 18-24, a disputation on v.18 drawing its content from the hymn. Vv. 25-26 set themselves off from their context by a repetition of the form displayed in vv. 18-24, but this time as an utterance in the mouth of Yahweh.

---

[59] Members 1 and 3 of the form.

[60] Member 4.

[61] Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, p. 128.

[62] 41:1ff., 21-29; 43:8-13.

Vv. 27-31 display a certain independence from the context by the change from plural address, reigning from v.18 through v.26, to the singular. These five verses constitute a disputation on the complaint quoted in v.27. The complaint appears in the form of an individual lament, and the disputation is formed in accordance. The hearer is invited to consider what he has long known from the traditions of Israel's cult, "Have you not known, have you not heard?" The content of the prophet's argument appears in hymnic style, sometimes used in the "expression of confidence" of the individual lament psalm.[63] In the lament psalm, the "expression of confidence" describes the basis on which the supplicant has confidence that Yahweh will answer his prayer. Thus vv. 27-31 reflect a close-knit disputation on a complaint by means of a style evolved directly from the lament psalm. In this way a certain independence from the context is displayed.

It now seems apparent that each part of Isaiah 40:12-31 has a certain degree of independent existence within the larger context. Now we may turn to the question of context with full force. What is to be made of this observation? Are we to assume that 40:12-31 is a collection of originally separate and complete speech units? Or is it more valid to view it as a conscious composition, each of whose four parts--v. 12-17, 18-24, 25-26, 27-31--reflects a particular form of disputation speech?

---

[63] Cf. Ps. 25:8; 102:13, Lam. 3:25.

Several factors stand in the way of the latter view. The sudden change from prophetic to divine speech in vv. 25-26 without warning does not fit easily if we have to do with a conscious composition. It is easier to view this phenomenon as the result of placing two similar but originally separate speeches side by side. The change from plural to singular address in vv. 27-31 is also difficult to explain from a theory of an originally unified poem. Even vv. 12-17 with its Wisdom form and content does not seem compatible with the rest of the context.

Yet in spite of the tensions within vv. 12-31, Westermann is correct in his inability to assess each unit as a speech able to stand by itself. Vv. 12-17 do not inform us of the exact dimensions of the dispute; we know only that Yahweh's absolute superiority is being defended and that the power of the nations is involved in the dispute. By the same token, vv. 18-24 and 25-26 tell us no more than the fact that Yahweh's supremacy is being demonstrated over against the gods. There is no hint of the precise circumstances giving rise to the dispute as is made clear, for example, in 45:9-13 or 46:5-11, where the dispute revolves around the emergence of Cyrus.[64] The fact that these three disputes in chapter 40, interpreted separately, seem detached from a concrete situation forces us to agree with Westermann that we must interpret them in the light of vv. 27-31. But the tensions within prevent acceptance of Westermann's belief that the speeches were originally composed in their present context. It seems more likely that 40:12-31 is a collection and reworking of speeches which originally appeared in another context. Either part of their original content was chopped off in order to make them general enough to apply to a new context, or they were originally complete speeches made clear by a context which was not preserved by the collector when he applied them to a new context. We cannot be sure precisely what happened.

It is surely no accident that this group of speeches, now in themselves unintelligible because they have been stripped from their original context, need vv. 27-31 to serve as a base for interpretation. Vv. 27-31 argue for Israel to have confidence that Yahweh can and will respond to their need, while vv. 12-26 argue that Yahweh can do it. This connection Westermann has seen correctly.[65] But his argument that vv. 12-31 as a whole are an imitation of the structure of the

---

[64] Even vv. 23-24 do not illumine the concrete situation. They also partake of the stereotyped language of hymnic style.

[65] Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, pp. 128ff.

"psalm of praise" (Lobpsalm) will not hold. Vv. 12-17 do not exhibit hymnic style. Moreover, the two-fold emphasis of God's sovereignty and mercy sometimes found in hymns is already present in vv. 27-31, as Westermann himself has already seen.[66] Thus his theory of form critical imitation is not a sufficient explanation for the heavy emphasis on the argument in vv. 12-26 that Yahweh can deliver his people. A more satisfactory explanation is to be found, in my opinion, in the structure of the first part of the Deutero-Isaianic corpus. The doubt concerning Yahweh's power raised by the exile provided a need for the prophet to argue persuasively against that doubt. But a prophet who draws his message from the language of the cult is limited by the fact that the lament psalm and the answering salvation oracle traditionally do not deal with the question as to whether Yahweh can save. His ability to do so has traditionally been assumed, and the question was whether he will save. But the new situation of doubt concerning Yahweh's power creates the need to overcome that doubt as well as to express confidence in Yahweh and to announce salvation. The Deutero-Isaianic corpus holds this new element and the traditional together by juxtaposition. Trial speeches, serving as arguments of Yahweh's power, are characteristically placed before salvation oracles.[67] This same structure is expressed by the disputation speech employing the cultic "expression of confidence" style (40:27-31) preceded by speeches which argue for Yahweh's power (vv. 12-26). Isaiah 40:12-31 introduces a section of the book in which this structure is common, as has been noted by Westermann.[68] This structural pattern of the early chapters of Deutero-Isaiah provides the basis for the collection and reworking of the introductory section 40:12-31.

---

[66] Ibid., p. 129.

[67] Is. 41:1ff.; 43:8ff.

In addition to the broad structural pattern suggested in the preceding paragraph, the inner connections which caused these particular speeches to be employed in that broad structure must be explored. One of the most important factors is a tight catchword connection: (1) questions introduced by מי (vv. 12, 13, 14, 18, 25), particularly with the question asking to whom God can be compared (vv. 18, 25), and (2) הלוא תדעו/הלוא ידעת (vv. 21, 28). The terms ברא (vv. 26, 28) and בין (vv. 14, 21) play a lesser role. A connection made up of several catchwords and phrases, particularly when they are used in the same formal structure[69] or in relation to the same subject matter[70] indicates a carefully planned pattern instead of a loose catchword connection.

---

[68] Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, p. 135.

[69] Vv. 18 and 25, 21 and 28. Vv. 21 and 28 are at the beginning of arguments with hymnic content and style.

[70] In this instance, the creation theme.

Thus 40:12-31 is a carefully planned collection of speeches which once existed separately, serving as a prelude for the speech pattern which occurs again in the early chapters. This kerygmatic unit--for it indeed presents one message--is not yet announcement of salvation, as in 41:1-20 and 43:8-21, but only "expression of confidence" in the salvation yet to be announced. In the structure of the psalm, announcement of salvation follows expression of confidence.

2. 46:5-11. These verses are a disputation as to whether any deity other than Yahweh is responsible for the "bird from the east" (v.11). Other gods are formed by men and are unable to save. Israel is exhorted to consider this fact (v.8),[71] then to remember what she knows of Yahweh (vv. 9ff.) --that his prophetic word comes true. Therefore, Israel can believe that only Yahweh can be the deity behind Cyrus' activity (v.11).

The form of 46:5-11 is outlined in framework form under the discussion of 40:18-24. But within that framework, an important formal distinction must be made. In 40:18-24, 25-26, when the prophet appeals for the opponents to consider the insight of what everyone knows from psalm tradition, the content of that common knowledge appears in the common third person style of Israel's hymns. But in 46:5-11, we find hymnic style as Yahweh's praise of himself. It begins with the self-predication, "I am God and *there is no other.*" Self-predication style occurs in Deutero-Isaiah primarily in salvation oracles on the one hand,[72] and trial speeches[73] and disputation speeches[74] on the other. In salvation oracles it serves as the basis for announcement of salvation.[75] Hymnic expansions of the self-predication style in this *Gattung* express Yahweh's saving relationship to Israel.[76] But in trial and disputation speeches the self-predication distinguishes Yahweh from other gods in polemic fashion. Often it is continued by an assertion that there is no other God but Yahweh.[77] The polemic use of self-praise hymnic style is not unique to Deutero-Isaiah. For instance, we possess a Sumerian hymn in which Inanna utters self-praise:

---

[71] The meaning of התאששו is uncertain.

---

[72] Cf. e.g., 41:13; 43:3, 15.

[73] Cf. e.g., 41:4; 43:10, 11, 12; 45:18, 19, 21.

[74] Cf. e.g., 46:9. Cf. W. Zimmerli, "Ich bin Jahwe," in *Geschichte und Altes Testament, Beitraege zur historischen Theologie,* Band 16 (Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953), p. 199.

[75] It is sometimes introduced by כי (41:13; 43:3), or it may be asyndeton (43:15).

[76] "I am Yahweh *your* God, who strengthens *your* right hand. . ." (41:13); "For I am Yahweh *your* God, the Holy One of *Israel, your savior*" (43:3); "I am Yahweh *your* Holy One, the creator of *Israel, your* king" (43:15).

[77] 43:11, 12-13; 45:18, 21; 46:9.

> My father has given me the heavens, has bestowed on me
> the earth:
> The queen of heaven am I. Does any god compare with me?
> ...The gods are birds, but I am the queen....
> Does any god compare with me?[78]

Another is an Akkadian hymn of Istar's self-praise, preserved fragmentarily:

> ....
> I rain upon enemies a battle like a flash of fire,
> ....
> I constantly traverse the heavens..., overturn the earth;
> Then I destroy the rest of the places,.......the enemies
> of Šamaš.
> I am the most warlike of the gods, etc.[79]

Self-praise of the deity has firm hymnic roots in the Near East,[80] both in Mesopotamia and Egypt. Insofar as we are able to tell,[81] however, these two hymns with polemic intent are not full-fledged disputations like 46:5-11; they are simply hymns with a polemic edge.

---

[78] A. Falkenstein and W. von Soden, ed., Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebete (Zuerich and Stuttgart: Artemis-Verlag, 1953), pp. 67-68.

[79] Ibid., pp. 239-240.

[80] Cf. E. Norden, Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religioeser Rede (Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1913), pp. 207ff. A recent treatment of the idea of the incomparability of the deity, which includes self-praise texts, is C. J. Labuschagne, The Incomparability of Yahweh in the Old Testament, Pretoria Oriental Series, Vol. V (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966).

[81] The fragmentary character of Istar's hymn makes certainty impossible.

As far as I know, self-praise of the deity does not have a real Sitz im Leben in disputation Gattungen. Therefore, we must conclude that Deutero-Isaiah is arbitrarily adapting a hymnic style well known to him into the framework of a disputation speech. He may have borrowed a form learned in Babylon, or he may be using a self-praise form from Israelite life not preserved to us; we cannot be sure. But we may be sure that the form is no longer employed in its original setting. In fact, we can see traces of Deutero-Isaiah's transformation of the self-praise hymnic style as he incorporates it in the framework of the disputation. He first employs hymnic participial style as a common point of agreement between him and his opponents (v.10),[82] proceeding then to a now undeniable assertion of the disputed matter in a parallel clause in the same style (v.11).[83] Nevertheless, the stability of Deutero-Isaiah's use of the overall framework reflected in 46:5-11 and 40:18-24 indicates at least a certain degree of independence from the context. This is reinforced by the fact that in the context of chapter 46, only vv. 5-11 deal explicitly with Cyrus or the matter of the reliability of Yahweh's word.

Westermann, however, believes that 46:5-11 is a part of a long poetic composition beginning as far back as 45:20--a composition made of imperatives (45:20,22; 46:3, 9, 12).[84] This poem emphasizes the contrast between the remnant of the nations (45:20) and the remnant of Israel (46:3).[85] Perhaps Westermann is correct that the arrangement of the text is not accidental, but his surface treatment has not succeeded in proving that the present form of the text is the original form. A more penetrating analysis is necessary to determine how tightly related vv. 5-11 are to the context.

---

[82] 45:12 is hymnic style using finite verbs to speak of past time. Cf. H. Gunkel, Einleitung in die Psalmen, 2nd. ed. (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966), pp. 51-52.

[83] Cf. also 45:13.

Vv. 5-11 seem to be more closely connected with vv. 12-13 than with any other part of the context. Only in vv. 8 and 12[86] is Israel addressed as sinful. In v.8 Israel's sinfulness is connected with her tendency to distrust Yahweh and to incline toward the belief that the gods are superior to Yahweh. This false view, whose ridiculous character sinful Israel is commanded to consider (v.8), is contrasted by the appeal to consider what is already known of the reliability of Yahweh's word (vv. 9-10). He has now spoken (דברתי) and purposed (יצרתי); he will bring it to pass (אביאנה) and will do it. (אעשנה). In the salvation oracle vv. 12-13, marked by a new address (שמעו), sinful Israel hears the announcement of salvation by means of the perfect, then the equivalent of the imperfect tense: "I am bringing near my righteousness" (קרבתי צדקתי) and "I will put salvation in Zion" (ונתתי בציון תשועה). This tense sequence is native to the salvation oracle.[87] The fact that this sequence of tenses occurs both in vv. 12-13 and v.11 must not be overlooked. The prophet announces that Yahweh's righteousness is already brought near (v.12) and that the consequences of what Yahweh has already begun will be seen in the future (v.13). But doubting Israel is not inclined to believe this word of Yahweh concerning the future. Therefore, a disputation speech is needed to provide credibility for the announcement of salvation. This disputation speech touches on the problem at issue: is Yahweh really sovereign so that his prophetic word can be believed? The disputation speech argues in the affirmative on the basis that in the past Yahweh has been known as one who prophesies the future. What Yahweh has now spoken (דברתי) with regard to Cyrus, i.e., the salvation which he is now announcing as already beginning (קרבתי), will come to pass in the future.

---

[84] Westermann considers vv. 5-8 a secondary addition, but cf. my footnote 57.

[85] Westermann, *Sprache und Struktur*, p. 152.

[86] The emendation of *ʼabbîrê lēb* (cf. Ps. 76:6) to *ʼōbĕdē lēb* by Duhm and Westermann is unnecessary. V.12b supports the present text. Cf. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia uebersetzt und erklaert*, 4th ed., *HKAT* 3/1 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1922), p. 354, and Westermann, *Sprache und Struktur*, p. 153.

In summary, vv. 5-11 and 12-13 are knit together very tightly: (1) in both Israel is addressed as sinful. (2) The tense sequence in both reflects the present time in which salvation is now already announced and the future in which fulfillment is to come. Thus 46:5-11 by itself is not a kerygmatic unit; it draws its significance in its direct relationship to vv. 12-13.

---

[87] Cf. Is. 41:8-13, 14-16; 43:1ff.

Now that the relationship of 46:5-11 to vv. 12-13 is established, we may now turn to the question of its relation to the preceding context. Although the closest contextual relationship is with vv. 12-13, we cannot doubt the existence of certain kinds of connections with the preceding context. For example, obvious catchword connections appear: סבל (46:4, 7), נשא (45:20; 46:1, 3, 4, 7), and the imperative שמעו (46:3, 12). In addition, certain thematic connections are apparent in chapters 45 and 46: (1) the theme of the reliability of Yahweh's prophetic word (45:18-21, 23; 46:5-11), (2) the theme of the remnant of the nations (45:20) and of Israel (46:3), and (3) the theme of carrying idols (45:20; 46:1-4, 7). The question is not whether these connections exist, but whether they are original and whether the relationship is kerygmatic.

Let us first examine 46:1-4. 46:1-4 is a unit in which the contrast of the powerless Babylonian gods which have to be carried is made with Yahweh, who carries his people. Although vv. 1-4 are composed form critically of a victory song (v. 1-2),[88] and a salvation oracle (vv. 3-4),[89] the passage cannot be dismembered into two independent units. The imitation of the victory song serves only as a contrast to the salvation oracle, which emphasizes how Yahweh can and does save his people from exile. Vv. 1-4 have in common with vv. 5-13 the theme of carrying idols, and to a limited extent the theme of the reliability of Yahweh's word.[90] But the weight of vv. 1-4 is certainly not on the reliability of Yahweh's word, as is the case in vv. 5-13. Moreover, the theme of carrying idols is reflected upon very differently. In vv. 1-4 the theme of carrying idols is the main point serving as a contrast to Yahweh's carrying of his people. In vv. 5ff., however, the idol who must be carried is set over against Yahweh's ability to declare the future. The fact that the idol must be carried is only one feature among several. Another difference between vv. 1-4 and 5-13 is that the message of promise to Israel as remnant in exile is central to the contrast of idols borne into captivity and Yahweh who sustains through and beyond exile in vv. 1-4, while the promise in vv. 5-13 is to sinful Israel with no mention of remnant whatsoever. All these differences point to the probability that vv. 1-4 are not connected kerygmatically with vv. 5-13. Each forms its own message-unit without need of the other.

---

[88] Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja*, pp. 55-56. Cf. Je. 50:2.

[89] *Ibid.*, p. 6. Note the new address in v. 3.

---

[90] The remnant Israel is called to hear salvation by Yahweh, who refers to his carrying of his people in hymnic style (vv. 3b-4a). Yahweh then makes it clear that he has done this in the past (אני עשיתי) and thus will do it in the future (ואני אשא). Incidentally, Westermann's contention that v. 4 is simply an expansion of the appositional participial clauses and that vv. 1-4 are not independent will not hold. V. 4b is very close to being a disputation, since the announcement of the future in the imperfect tense is based on the fact that Yahweh has acted this way in the past (v. 4ba). The past serves as the point of common agreement.

We cannot now penetrate further into the question of context for 46:5-11. The original unity of vv. 5-11 with v. 12-13 seems likely, as well as the secondary connection with v. 1-4. The larger questions with regard to the speech-complex relating to Cyrus in 44:24-48:22 must be deferred to a later chapter. At this point we must remain content with having tried to demonstrate at a very basic level the relations of speech-form and context.

3. *45:9-13.* This passage makes use of a characteristic speech-form--rhetorical questions concerning the incredibility of the one who handles an object to be inferior to the object. Our passage opens with this "handler-handled" disputation form:

> Woe is upon the one who contends with his maker, the potsherd with the potter.[91]
> Does the clay say to its maker, "What are you making?" or "Your work has no handles?"
> Woe is upon the one who says to a father, "What are you begetting?" or to a woman, "With what are you in travail?"

This speech-form may appear with[92] or without[93] the woe sentence.

---

[91] MT now reads, "a potsherd among earthen pots." Parallelism, however, would suggest reading *ḥārāš* instead of *ḥarśē*. For a discussion of the text cf. Torrey, *The Second Isaiah* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), p. 359.

[92] Is. 29:15; 45:9.

[93] Is. 10:15; Rom. 9:20ff.

The form draws on the background of the contest fable.[94] Our particular rhetorical question speech-form takes the disputational character of the contest fable into its own particular form of speech, i.e., the "handler-handled" questions. It has its place in everyday life and may be used in various ways. It may be used as a disputation proper (Is. 10:15; 45:9-10; Rom. 9-20ff.). Or it may be used in situations which only approximate disputation--to lend weight to a woe sentence used as prophetic indictment (Is. 29:15-16) or to emphasize the truth of a didactic saying (the Sayings of Ahikar).[95] The variety in its use is accompanied by variety in the way the speaker can move from these rhetorical questions, which provide a basis of agreement with opponents, to resolve the disputed matter. In Isaiah 10:15 the opponent is left to draw the conclusion for himself,[96] whereas in Romans 9:20ff., the application to the concrete situation of dispute appears in the form of questions dealing with the disputed matter (vv. 22ff.). Isaiah 45:9-13 resolves the dispute in the following manner:

---

[94] Cf. H. Gressmann, Israels Spruchweisheit (Berlin: Karl Curtius, 1925), pp. 28-29; R.J. Williams, "The Fable in the Ancient Near East," A Stubborn Faith, Ed., Edward C. Hobbs (Dallas: SMU Press, 1956), p. 7.

[95] "Why should wood strive with the fire, meat with the knife, a man with the king?" This follows a didactic saying concerning obedience to the king. Cf. A. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford University Press, 1923), pp. 216, 223.

[96] We need not decide whether vv. 16ff. are original or secondary. Even if they are original, these verses are not the disputed matter but rather the announcement that can be made once the dispute is settled. The dispute has to do with the legitimacy of Assyria's boasts. V. 15 uses the "handler-handled" disputation form as a basis of common agreement. The opponent is left to draw the proper conclusion for himself concerning the legitimacy of Assyria's boasts.

> Thus says Yahweh the Holy One of Israel and his Maker,
> "Will you question me about my sons,[97] will you command
> me concerning the work of my hands?"

The answer to these questions is, "No." Then Yahweh appeals to what is known about him in tradition (v. 12) in order to command assent to his claim about Cyrus (v. 13):

> I made the earth, and I created mankind upon it;
> My hand stretched out the heavens, and I commanded all
> their hosts.
> I aroused him in righteousness, and I will make straight
> all his ways;
> He will build my city and release my exiles,
> Not for a price or bribe, says Yahweh Sabaoth.

Deutero-Isaiah's way of resolving the dispute based on "handler-handled" questions departs from the normal procedure. Normally the speech-form appears in human rather than divine speech. In the use of the form in Isaiah 29:15-16 Yahweh is spoken of in the third person, which indicates that the speaker was conceived to be human, and as far as the time of Paul it was natural to use this form as human speech. Even in Isaiah 10:15, where Yahweh appears to be the speaker, we have a literary imitation of a normal dispute between two people. In this context, however, the prophet has represented one of the parties as Yahweh. Only in Isaiah 45:9-13, where a dispute between prophet and people seems real enough, do we find Yahweh as a partner in the dispute through his prophetic messenger.[98] Deutero-Isaiah transforms the human "handler-handled" disputation form into a prophetic messenger speech. Moreover, apart from the introductory and closing formulae of the messenger speech, Yahweh does not speak in normal oracular form. He first speaks in disputational form, applying the imagery of vv. 9-10 to the relationship of Yahweh and people (v.11b). Then he carries on the disputation in self-praise hymnic style (vv. 12-13). Thus 45:9-13 is an imitation and transformation of a non-prophetic Gattung. Deutero-Isaiah's fusion of "handler-handled" style with messenger speech and self-praise of the deity--each of which has a different Sitz im Leben--can be attributed to nothing other than his own creativity. Nevertheless, every element of this speech is employed for the purposes of disputation. The messenger-speech style gives the prophet's words the authority of Yahweh, and the style of the cultic hymn provides part of the content of the argument in its appeal to widely-accepted Israelite tradition.

---

[97] Read *hā'attem tišālūnī* with the Targum.

Although Isaiah 45:9-13 stands out from its context as a disputation speech throughout, the question of its relationship to the context is not settled. The reference to Cyrus by the third person pronoun in v.13 suggests that vv. 9-13 did not originally stand alone. But is the present context the original context? We must analyze the nature of the dispute reflected in 45:9-13 in order to determine whether that dispute fits with the present context. In this dispute between Yahweh the Creator and Israel the created, is the issue the question whether the heathen Cyrus could possibly be used as Yahweh's instrument? Or is it a dispute whether it is Yahweh or another god behind Cyrus, as in several other speeches?[99] First of all, it is noteworthy that there is no concern here about the reliability of Yahweh's prophetic word. In most speeches which dispute the contention that Yahweh is not the god who motivates Cyrus, the ability of the deity to prophesy the future is the supreme test.[100] But in 45:9-13 the interrogations in vv. 9b-10 question what the superior is doing; no doubt exists whether he is superior. V.11 reflects the same situation. Therefore, Yahweh's use of an agreed-upon past activity as a part of his argument (v.12) functions as a reinforcement of the indubitable superiority of Yahweh over against questioning Israel, paving the way for a resolution of the dispute in v.13. Israel the created must not doubt Yahweh's plan to use the heathen Cyrus as his instrument of salvation. The use of the pronoun הוא preceding the finite verb in v.13b probably serves to emphasize the reality of the role of the heathen Cyrus in Yahweh's sovereign plan. The fact that Cyrus will do it "without price or bribe" is an indication that he functions solely as Yahweh's instrument.[101] Thus we may assume a dispute whose subject is not the question whether Yahweh is superior over the gods, but rather whether Israel has any grounds to doubt the particular manner which Yahweh chooses to execute his saving plan.

---

[98] Note the prophetic formulae כה אמר יהוה and אמר יהוה צבאות .

---

[99] Is. 41:1ff., 21-29; 46:5-11; 48:12-15.

[100] Is. 41:21-29; 46:5-11; 48:12-15. Cf. also 43:8-13 and 45:18-21, where Cyrus is not explicitly mentioned.

Now that the nature of the dispute seems clear, we must turn directly to the question of context. The fact that the dispute in vv. 9-13 concerns the credibility of the role of Cyrus in Yahweh's plan causes us to see close ties between vv. 9-13 and those verses which precede (44:24ff.). Yahweh will "make straight" Cyrus' way (45:2, 13).[102] The salvation of Israel (45:4) as the rebuilding of Jerusalem is the goal of Yahweh's use of Cyrus (44:26, 28; 45:13).

---

[101] The attempts of some commentators to reconcile the fact that Yahweh does not buy Israel in 45:13 with the different view in 43:3 are unnecessary. 43:3 is a witness to the extent to which Yahweh is willing to go because of his love for Israel, while 45:13 deals with Yahweh's sovereignty over world events.

[102] The meaning of hădūrīm in MT (v. 2) is not clear. LXX and 1QIsa read hărārīm. In any case, the context makes it plain that Yahweh is preparing the way for Cyrus.

More cannot be said, however, until 44:24ff is analyzed.

The connection of vv. 9-13 with the following context is not so direct. A complete shift in imagery occurs. Vv. 14-17 contain no mention of Cyrus, direct or indirect. The address shifts to Zion (second feminine singular). This change of address is important because it is of a piece with a particular Israelite tradition not present before v. 14. The appearance of this tradition alerts us to a significant shift in context. Vv. 14-17 belong to a traditionary complex in which, among other things,[103] the nations come to Zion bringing home the exiled Israelites[104] and the treasures of those nations.[105] They will come in supplication, but Yahweh's people will not be "put to shame."[106] Deutero-Isaiah has used this tradition selectively by emphasizing only these features of it,[107] but his dependence upon that circle of tradition is clear. His appropriation of this tradition is to be distinguished sharply from those passages in which the prophet uses the address "Jacob-Israel" coupled with the concern with the reliability of

---

[103] Cf. G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. II, trans. by D.M.G. Stalker (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), pp. 239-240, 293ff.

[104] Is. 49:22ff.; 60:1ff.

[105] Is. 45:14-17; 60:1ff.; Hag. 2:7-8.

[106] Is. 45:14-17; 49:22-23.

[107] Cf. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. II, p. 295.

Yahweh's word. Moreover, this tradition of the nations' pilgrimage to Zion is never used by Deutero-Isaiah elsewhere to refer explicitly to the Cyrus event. Therefore, vv. 14-17 do not appear to be related originally to the preceding verses. Moreover, we have no explicit connections in the text to indicate that a collector welded vv. 9-13 and 14-17 into one message-unit.

4. 44:24-28. This passage has provoked disagreement concerning its Gattung. Gressmann[108] views it as hymnic, Koehler[109] as a messenger speech which has incorporated the style of self-predication, and Begrich[110] and von Waldow[111] as a disputation speech. All of them agree, however, that the speech is a self-contained unit. Recently a new approach has been suggested by Westermann. Although he, like Gressmann, views these verses as a hymn, he does not believe that they constitute an independent unit. Instead, 44: 24-28 is a hymnic introduction to the poetic composition 44: 24-45: 7. The group of participial clauses in vv. 24-28 are merely in apposition to the self-predication in v. 24; the main body of the text--an oracle to a king--begins in 45:1ff., following the expanded introductory self-predication (44:24-28).[112]

---

[108] Gressmann, op. cit., pp. 285, 287, 289.

[109] Koehler, op. cit., p. 105.

[110] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 42, 44.

[111] von Waldow, Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja, p. 36.

[112] Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, pp. 144-151.

Westermann's suggestion that 44:24-28 is not to be separated from 45:1-7 has merit, particularly in view of the similarity in subject matter. Thus the question must be reopened. Is it true that 44:24-28 is only a hymnic introduction to something that follows? Or does it stand alone as a self-contained unit, possibly as a disputation or a hymn?

It seems obvious that vv. 24-28 employ the style of the hymn. We have observed already that the self-praise of the deity has a firm place in the hymn.[113] The string of participial attributions is also traceable to that Gattung.[114] But we must determine whether the prophet has here incorporated a true hymn or whether he has imitated one. The fact that vv. 24-28 begin with a messenger formula suggests that these verses are not a true hymn. Historically the prophets used the messenger formula to introduce oracles.[115] One suspects that Deutero-Isaiah's use of the messenger formula here is an indication that the following clauses in hymnic style are employed for purposes other than praise. Begrich is correct, I believe, that these verses serve as a disputation.[116] In the situation of doubt occasioned by the exile the prophet has Yahweh argue from what Israel already knows about Yahweh in order to allay their uncertainty regarding the future. In the style of the hymn Yahweh appeals to generally-accepted knowledge of his activity (vv. 24-26a). With v. 26b Yahweh turns to things yet unfulfilled--the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the victory of Cyrus. Normally the hymn uses participial style for past events or for attributive statements which are essentially timeless.[117] Thus the participial clauses in vv. 26b-28 are a departure from the usual practice. Moreover, they are marked by a stylistic change seen in the definite article before the participle. Vv. 26b-28, in my opinion, are the conclusion of the disputation; Yahweh has argued from the known in order to convince doubters of that which is not yet generally agreed upon.

---

[113] Cf. my discussion of 46:5-11.

[114] Cf. e.g., Ps. 103:3ff.; 104:2ff.

[115] Cf. e.g., Am. 5:3, 16; 7:17; Is. 28:16; 31:4.

[116] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 44.

It would seem, then, that 44:24-28 is a self-contained disputation rather than an introduction to a longer poetic unit. But Westermann's argument that vv. 24-28 are incomplete gramatically remains to be considered. Unfortunately we do not possess texts which are exactly parallel to the grammatical structure of 44:24-28. But Psalm 103 is sufficiently analogous to illumine the problem. Psalm 103, like

---

[117] Ps. 136 is an example of participial clauses used to praise Yahweh's past deeds. Ps. 103:3ff., 104:2ff., 113:6ff. are illustrations of the participial clause used to describe Yahweh's deeds and attributes which are characteristic of him in all times.

Isaiah 44:24-28, contains a series of participial clauses which are attached to the introduction (vv. 3-7). To be sure, the participial clauses in vv. 3-7 are continued by other stylistic elements (vv. 8ff.). But these participial clauses are not subordinate gramatically to what follows; they stand on their own as independent affirmations. In all likelihood this is true also of the participial clauses in Isaiah 44:24-28. The fact that Israel is no longer the addressee in 45:1-7 is additional evidence that 45:1 begins a new grammatical unit.

Having determined that 44:24-28 stands out from its context as a disputation, we must now decide whether its relation to the surrounding context is kerygmatic. We are able to determine with ease that vv. 24-28 are not now--even because of the work of the collector--a continuation of the message of the preceding context. V. 23, which exhibits the form of a hymn,[118] is an independent formal unit. Furthermore, the speaker in v. 23 is the psalmist, while Yahweh is the speaker in vv. 24-28. No reason for such a transition is given to us in the text. Indeed, the only apparent connections are found in the catchwords עשה and גאל (vv. 23-24). All these considerations lead us to assume that the relationship between v.23 and vv. 24-28 is on the basis of an outer catchword connection.

---

[118] Note the summons to praise in imperative style, followed by substantiating clauses which portray what Yahweh has done.

The ties between 44:24-28 and 45:1-7 are quite close. Both mention Cyrus by name as an agent of Yahweh's deliverance of his people. Is it possible that two speeches, although separable form critically, form one message unit? A close examination, however, indicates that the two units focus on the Cyrus event differently. 45:1-7, which Westermann identifies quite correctly as an oracle connected with the anointing of a king,[119] reflects the prophet's attempt to explain Yahweh's surprising choice of the pagan Cyrus as his instrument of salvation. This oracle takes great pains to show that Cyrus, who does not know Yahweh, is chosen for the sake of Israel (v. 4). If the surprise that a pagan should be Yahweh's agent is the fundamental reason for uttering 45:1-7, we may ascribe general despair as the mood which prompted the creation of 44:24-28. Here Yahweh is not trying to argue against doubt that a non-Israelite could be his instrument; instead, we have the more general circumstance that Jerusalem is destroyed and the people in exile.[120] Against the doubt that prevails among the people Yahweh argues that Yahweh will be rebuilt, that Israel will be delivered. Cyrus is the agent of salvation, the prophet has Yahweh say, but this is said only to overcome despair. These differences between 44:24-28 and 45:1-7 suggest that the connection between them is not kerygmatic.

---

[119] Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, pp. 148ff.

[120] Cf. vv. 26b, 28b.

In the discussion of 45:9-13 above we noted the similarities of that text with 44:24-28 and 45:1-7. At that point we found it necessary to postpone the question of context pending the analysis of 44:24ff. Our conclusions regarding 44:24-28 and 45:1-7, if they are correct, rule out any notion that 44:24-45:13 is a kerygmatic unit. If 44:24-28 and 45:1-7 are secondarily juxtaposed, what shall we conclude with regard to the similarity of 45:9-13 with both 44:24-28 (44:26, 28; 45:13b) and 45:1-7 (45:2, 13a)? Is 45:9-13 a disputation composed as a kind of midrash after 44:24-28 and 45:1-7 were joined? Or was it originally a part of 45:1ff., with the implication that the similarities of 45:9-13 with 44:24-28 were the reason for a later attachment of the latter to 45:1-13? Or are 44:24-28, 45:1-7, and 45:9-13 three originally separate units? I do not believe that these questions can be resolved satisfactorily. At the same time, certain observations can be made. 45:9-13 is more closely tied to 45:1-7 than to 44:24-28. 45:9-13, as we noted in the discussion of that passage, is a disputation to overcome doubt that Yahweh plans to make use of the heathen Cyrus to carry out his purpose. Moreover, the reference to Cyrus by the pronoun (v. 13) without antecedent suggests that vv. 9-13 did not originally stand alone. These considerations might suggest that vv. 9-13 are a continuation of 45:1ff. The short hymn in v. 8, however, is troublesome. What is its role? And if, as I shall argue in the final chapter, hymns in the Deutero-Isaianic corpus are generally the work of a collector, why would a collector insert a hymn between the parts of a kerygmatic unit? So far as I can see, answers are lacking. We must content ourselves with observing that 44:24-28, 45:1-7, and 45:9-13 are connected by theme. The first two are not a message unit, and the relations between the second and third are unclear.

5. 48:1-11. The literary problems presented by this passage are vexing. Most perplexing is the curious mixture of second person singular and plural. Attempts to solve the problem along literary-critical lines have proved unsatisfactory, however. The attempts of Duhm[121] and Westermann[122] to make separations on the basis of content are unconvincing, in part because they do not proceed along the lines of the singular-plural dichotomy. But even Begrich's attempt to delineate the fusion of two originally separate texts--one in the singular (v.4, 5, 6b, 7, 8, 9, 10) and one in the plural (v.1-3, 6a, 11)[123] runs into the problem that neither text can stand alone well. Therefore, we must agree with von Waldow that the present state of the text must be accepted.[124] Whatever the history of the text may have been,

---

[121] Duhm, op. cit., pp. 360ff.

[122] Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, p. 154.

[123] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 169-170.

[124] von Waldow, Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja, p. 32.

we can interpret it now only in its present form.

Although we cannot agree with von Waldow's assumption that this text displays the one disputation speech-form which he supposes as existent throughout Deutero-Isaiah, he is correct in classifying it as a disputation speech. V. 6a is an appeal to the prophet's opponents to declare their agreement to what is already known (v.3-5) as a basis upon which to proceed with the rest of the disputation (vv. 6bff.). But it is a complex speech. It begins with an introduction in the style of the prophetic invective. "Hear this!" or, "Hear this word!", followed by invective in participial or relative clause style, occurs in several places in prophetic literature.[125] Vv. 3ff., however, depart from the form of the prophetic invective, and the disputation begins. It is a complex disputation made up of several elements delicately balanced. In this way it differs from most of Deutero-Isaiah's disputations, in which appeal to the long-known reliability of Yahweh's prophetic word with regard to the "former things" is used as a basis for commanding assent to the "new things" now being prophesied. But in 48:1-11 simplicity is left behind with the inseparable combination of the theme of Yahweh's word then and now with the theme of Yahweh who saves rebellious Israel only for the sake of his name. These elements intertwined among one another seem at first glance to blur the sharpness of the speech. To what concrete situation of disputation is this speech addressed?

---

[125] Cf. e.g., Am. 4:1; 8:4. Cf. also Is. 28:14, where the introduction is, "Hear the word of Yahweh."

Vv. 3-6a provide an initial point of entry in reconstructing the situation of dispute. Yahweh presupposes agreement between him and his opponents that he prophesied the "former things" before they occurred so that sinful Israel would not attribute them to another god. The view of the opponents which Yahweh is disputing, as von Waldow correctly observes,[126] is the following: Yahweh has not told Israel long beforehand of the events now taking place. Therefore, they must not be Yahweh's deeds. But Yahweh, taking issue with this view, invites Israel to consider why he prophesied the "former things" (vv. 3-6a). He did so in order that his deeds would not be attributed to another god, as everyone can agree (v. 6a). Now Israel is told why Yahweh waits until now to declare the "new things." If he does not perform the "new things," he will forfeit his glory to another deity (vv. 9, 11); therefore he determines to refine Israel rather than to destroy her (v. 10). In the case of both the "former things" and the "new things" Yahweh uses his prophetic word to prevent his honor from being attributed to another god. But in the case of the "new things"--the Cyrus event and its saving consequences for Israel--Yahweh must proceed in a new way. If he should announce the salvation long beforehand, Israel would know (v. 7b) and deal faithlessly (v. 8b), spoiling the refinement planned by Yahweh. Thus only now when the events are appearing on the scene does he prophesy them.

---

[126] von Waldow, Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja, pp. 33-34.

As has been the case with most of Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches, there is no real Sitz im Leben for this speech in Israel's oral tradition. Instead, it is a free creation of Deutero-Isaiah. The style of prophetic invective (vv. 1-2) is combined with disputation (vv. 3-11). But even vv. 3-11 do not reflect a pure Gattung which can be labeled disputation. In fact, the elements of disputation are incorporated within an aetiological narrative in the mouth of Yahweh explaining his purposes with regard to the "former things" and the "new things." A similar aetiological narrative appears in Genesis 3: 21ff., there in third person narrative with Yahweh's words quoted:

> Yahweh Elohim said, "Behold, the man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil. And now, lest he stretch out his hand and take also from the tree of life and eat and live forever-- . . . .[127]

Deutero-Isaiah puts this kind of narrative in Yahweh's mouth for the purposes of disputation, a function not original to that narrative type.

In spite of Deutero-Isaiah's fusion of several Gattungen in this speech, 48:1-11 stands out from its context by the fact that it is a unit of reflection on the particular issue under dispute mentioned above.

---

[127] Cf. Ex. 13:17 for another example of such an aetiological narrative.

The entire speech, although complex, deals with that particular question, and the larger context does not appear to reflect upon that issue at all.

How is 48:1-11 related to its context? If chapter 47 can be considered secondary,[128] 48:1-11 has obvious catchword connections with 46:5-13 and 48:12ff.--the imperative of שמע (46:12; 48:1, 12), ראשון (46:9; 48:3, 12), and קרא, particularly when that verb refers to Israel's relationship to Yahweh (48:1, 2, 8, 12). Moreover, there are thematic relationships, particularly the matter of Yahweh's prophetic word in the past and present (46:5-13; 48:1-11; 48:12-15) and the theme of Israel as sinful (46:8, 12; 48:1-11). Is 48:1-11 originally a part of the surrounding context?

Let us turn first to its relationship to 46:5-13. In that text, Israel's sin is connected with her tendency in this particular historical situation to doubt Yahweh's power over against foreign gods and therefore not to believe the present word of salvation. But in 48:1-11, the issue is not Yahweh's power, but rather the question as to why he only now declares the "new things." Israel's sin is not connected with doubt in this particular moment of history, but her general perversity from birth (48:8b). Here her sinful nature is the sole reason for Yahweh's timing his prophetic word variously in differing situations. How different this is from the more limited role sin displays in 46:5-13!

---

[128] Mowinckel, op. cit., pp. 102-103.

These considerations make it doubtful that 48:1-11 was originally connected with 46:5-13. The themes common to both passages are reflected upon in such different ways that it is difficult to believe that they were uttered in the same kerygmatic unit. Each has its own self-contained set of circumstances, neither depending upon the other contextually for fuller meaning. It is more likely that the connection is an outer one on the basis of catchword and theme.

The same conclusion is to be drawn with regard to the relations of 48:1-11 and 48:12-15. In vv. 12-15 the question under dispute concerns the power of Yahweh over against the gods (v. 14ab), and the theme of Yahweh's prophetic word in the past, to which all can agree, is the basis for demolishing objection to the reliability of his present announcement concerning Cyrus. Moreover, it is to be noted that the theme of Israel as sinner does not appear in vv. 12-15. Finally, it must be observed that the verb קרא functions differently in each passage. In 48:1-11, there is a contrast between Israel who calls herself by the name of Israel and the holy city (vv. 1, 2) and Yahweh, who calls her a rebel from birth (v. 8b). In vv. 12-15, by contrast, the verb refers to creation-election as a way of contrasting Yahweh's creative word in the beginning with the manifestation of it now through Cyrus. Israel, Yahweh's "called" (i.e., created by election), is asked to consider what Yahweh "called" at the beginning. No other nation with its gods can produce such a past, so it may be concluded that Cyrus is "called" by Yahweh.

Catchwords and themes function so differently in these two passages that it is difficult to consider them as a kerygmatic unit. Therefore, we suggest that they are contiguous by later juxtaposition.

6. 42:18-25. Up to the present time there has been no satisfactory form critical analysis of this text. Gressmann calls it a Scheltwort,[129] but his analysis is very sketchy. Koehler calls it a Streitgespraech,[130] but presents no detailed arguments for his view. Begrich and von Waldow omit a discussion of the text. For my part, I see no prospect for a fully adequate form critical description of the text. At the same time, I am convinced that Westermann's view of it as something like a disputation speech[131] is a fruitful approach.

In Westermann's view a lament psalm lies behind this text. This lament psalm contains the complaint that Yahweh is blind and deaf to Israel's need with the result that Israel has fallen prey to plunderers. In vv. 18-25 Yahweh disputes the claim that he is blind. Instead, it is Israel who is blind, and they are plundered because of their lack of obedience to their role as servant. Westermann points to the questions introduced by מי to suggest the similarity of these verses with disputation speech. These significant insights, however, are unfortunately not developed.[132]

---

[129] Gressmann, op. cit., p. 270.

[130] Koehler, op. cit., p. 111.

[131] Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja: Kapitel 40-66, ATD, Teilband 19 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966), pp. 89-94.

In spite of the apparent impossibility of a fully-satisfying form critical analysis of this text, the arguments for its function as a disputation speech, presented first by Koehler and then by Westermann, can be amplified. Westermann is undoubtedly correct that v. 22 reflects the cultic complaint, "We are a people plundered and spoiled; all of us are trapped in holes...." He is probably also correct that Yahweh is answering a complaint that he is blind and deaf to his people's plight.[133] There are additional signs that vv. 18-25 are a disputation on such a lament. By means of imperatives to "hear" and "look", the "blind and deaf" are summoned to gain a new perspective.[134] It is for their future profit that they should do so (v. 23). Even clearer than the imperatives is the transition from v. 24a to v. 24b. After summoning the hearers for the sake of the future, the prophet has Yahweh ask this question (introduced by מי): "Who gave Jacob to plunderers and Israel to spoilers?" The answer to this question is in the form of a rhetorical question (v. 24b). Vv. 24b-25 constitute the conclusion to this disputation, whose argument has been presented in the preceding verses.[135]

---

[132] Moreover, Westermann's work is hampered by arbitrary emendations of the text.

[133] This occurs in the complaint section of lament psalms (cf. Hab. 1:13) and also in the petition (e.g., Ps. 28:1; 35:22; 39:13; 83:2; 109:1).

[134] The imperatives in v. 18 are indications that this is a disputation speech. Such imperatives occur elsewhere in speeches designed to present an argument against an opposing view. For example, in 2 Sam. 20:16ff., a wise woman employs an imperative to introduce a speech designed to convince Joab that he should not destroy the city of Abel. In Jb. 33:1, 31, 33 Elihu is trying to convince Job of the truth of his position over against what Job has said.

The course of the argument is as follows: the disputation against the complaint that Yahweh has been deaf and sightless to the plundering of his people begins with a summons for the blind and deaf to "hear" and "look" in order to see (v. 18). Then the prophet has Yahweh dispute the complaint that Yahweh is blind and deaf with the question, "Who is blind but my servant...?" The question is rhetorical, implying that no one is blind and deaf but Yahweh's servant Israel--a nation which has seen and heard Yahweh's will without being obedient. Then the typical style of the hymn of thanksgiving influences the language of the argument (v. 21). We have examples of similar phraseology from Israel's hymns, in which Yahweh is praised for "magnifying"[136] his saving power[137] on behalf of Israel (or Israel's anointed). It was precisely for delivery out of difficult circumstances, often political,[138] that the psalmist customarily gave thanks. Deutero-

---

[135] Note the stylistic similarity of the conclusion to the argument in 45:21bβ.

[136] Hiph'il of גדל.

[137] That is to say, his ישוע and his חסד (Ps. 18:51). Cf. also Ps. 138:2, but the text appears to be in disarray.

[138] Cf. e.g., Ps. 18.

Isaiah employs this kind of hymnic phrase as a point of agreement between him and his hearers. Every Israelite should be able to give assent to such a statement about Yahweh. Having reached this point of agreement, the prophet has Yahweh point out that Israel is not saved but plundered.[139] What does this desperate state of affairs signify? That Yahweh is blind and deaf? That Yahweh has allowed Israel to be plundered for no good reason? No! It is instead Israel's sin, so vv. 24b-25 argue, that accounts for their present plight. Deutero-Isaiah has used the contrast of what is known by Israelites of Yahweh's saving power (v. 21) and the miserable plight of Israel (v. 22) to undermine Israel's complaint concerning Yahweh's inactivity. If Yahweh is known to be a God who saves his people, yet his people are plundered with no one to deliver, then it must be that Israel has sinned, not that Yahweh has been sightless and unhearing. Israel must see and hear this in order to profit for the future.

It is clear that this disputation is not a real disputation between Yahweh and people. Yahweh, rather than the prophet (who is, of course, the real speaker), is cast as the speaker. In fact, we can see that the role of Yahweh as speaker of the disputation is not firm, for Yahweh is sometimes spoken of in the third person (vv. 21, 24bβγ), and the speaker once identifies himself with the people (v. 24bα). The fact that this speech is an imitation of real disputation speech is also shown by the fact that there is no real Sitz in Israel for Yahweh to answer a lament psalm with a disputation. Thus 42:18-25 is a literary creation on the part of Deutero-Isaiah.

---

[139] Note the contrast implied by the conjunction at the beginning of v. 22.

Turning now to the question of context, the speech separates itself from its context as a dispute on the particular complaint that Yahweh has been sightless and deaf to the plundering of his people. The surrounding context does not reflect that particular complaint. In fact, in the preceding context (vv. 14-17)--a speech of salvation--the mention of Israel as blind does not resemble the use of that image in vv. 18-25. Only the blind, not the deaf, are mentioned in vv. 14-17. Moreover, vv. 14-17 are a promise of salvation to the needy blind, while vv. 18-25 are a disputation on a complaint, in which the states of blindness and deafness are viewed in a negative manner. Thus a kerygmatic connection is unlikely. Vv. 18-25 separates itself from the following context (43:1ff.) by form, in that the latter reflects the Gattung of a cultic salvation oracle.[140] It remains to be seen whether 42: 18-25 and 43:1ff. are related kerygmatically.

C. SUMMARY

I have attempted to demonstrate in this chapter that Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches derive their structure, not from a slavish use of traditional disputation *Gattungen*, but rather from the prophet's own shaping of well-known patterns of speech. In this process, however, he was not oblivious to or even free from the conventions of customary styles of speaking. As we have seen, the impact of various *Gattungen* is observable. Indeed, compared with the freedom of most modern Western poets, our prophet's disputations reflect a considerable inability to depart very far from oral speech-forms. Moreover, it has become apparent, I believe, that he has continued the practice of his predecessors of uttering short speeches. At the same time, Deutero-Isaiah felt free to fuse and transform oral *Gattungen* in order to meet the the situation of his time.

---

[140] Cf. chapter IV.

The lack of a *Sitz im Leben* for Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches outside his own preaching does not justify the conclusion that questions of form are irrelevant. It has been demonstrated here, I believe, that some of his disputation speeches have a kind of stereotyped structure, although the structure appears to be Deutero-Isaianic in origin. More significant is the fact that these speeches can be separated from their context because they are disputation speeches throughout. This discovery has resulted in a more precise ability to ask where the lines of kerygmatic unity and disunity are.

III. TRIAL SPEECHES

The work of Begrich[1] is the first form critical work of far-reaching significance for Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches, for he was the first to make a detailed form critical description of this Gattung.[2] Since that time two works of von Waldow[3] and the analysis of Westermann[4] have appeared, along with the discussion of certain Deutero-Isaianic trial speeches by H. J. Boecker in his analysis of

---

[1] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, BWANT, 4 Folge, Heft 25 (77) Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), pp. 18-41.

[2] Both Gressmann and Koehler recognized the presence of this Gattung in Deutero-Isaiah. Gressmann, however, pressed back no further than the pre-exilic prophets' use of this Gattung. Moreover, he simply assumed, rather than demonstrated, that Deutero-Isaiah's use of the Gattung is a direct borrowing and modification of his prophetic predecessors. Koehler, by contrast, looked beyond the prophets. He believed that Deutero-Isaiah's Streitgespraeche (he did not distinguish between disputation and trial speech) were dependent upon the language of trial proceedings at home in the Israelite town gate. But he made no detailed analysis of the forms in order to prove his contention. Cf. Gressmann, "Die literarische Analyse Deuterojesajas," ZAW 34 (1914) , pp. 277-280, and Koehler, Deuterojesaja stilkritisch untersucht (Giessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1923), pp. 110-124.

[3] von Waldow, Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rheinischen Friedrich Wilhelms-Universitaet at Bonn, 1953); Der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der prophetischen Gerichtsreden, BZAW 85 (Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann, 1963) . In the latter the author presents a revised statement of his view of Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches. Cf. pp. 42-53.

[4] Westermann, Sprache und Struktur der Prophetie Deuterojesajas, in Forschung am alten Testament, Theologische Buecherei, Band 24 (Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1964), pp. 134ff.

legal forms in the Old Testament.[5] The positions argued by these scholars differ significantly from one another. These differences prompt us to ask whether it is possible to discover through form critical analysis that Deutero-Isaiah uses speech-forms from the trial or whether he is a free literary creator who occasionally uses the imagery of the trial. Is it really possible to isolate a form (or forms) with a definite Sitz im Leben? And is this form used in its original setting? Or is it an imitation of a form, now employed in a new setting? In addition, the question of form must be asked in conjunction with the question of context. Are Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches independent units with no relation to their context? Or does he employ speech-forms as small segments of a larger kerygmatic whole? The alternative view is that Deutero-Isaiah's speeches reflecting the trial cannot be isolated from their context as speech-units exhibiting the form of a particular Gattung.

In order to deal with these questions, we must first analyze the history of form critical research on this problem in order to determine whether this method, so successful with many other prophets, can illumine Deutero-Isaiah's trial language. Then each speech must be examined carefully with attention to the context. To be sure, the fact that all of the Gattungen allegedly present in Deutero-Isaiah have not yet been examined here presents limits on this exegetical work. Nevertheless, preliminary forays into the immediate context of each speech can serve as a foundation for a more thorough examination later on of the plan of the entire Deutero-Isaianic corpus.

---

[5] Boecker, Redeformen des Rechtslebens im alten Testament, WMANT 14 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964).

Immediately we confront a problem with regard to procedure. Begrich and von Waldow see all Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches in relation to one Sitz im Leben, while Westermann makes a sharp distinction between the speeches in which Yahweh opposes Israel and those in which Yahweh is set over against the nations. It is not possible to justify fully in advance the arguments to be presented in this chapter; therefore a simple statement of procedure must suffice at this point. The speeches between Yahweh and Israel and those involving Yahweh and the nations will be considered separately. It will become clear, I believe, that there are sufficient differences to warrant separate treatment.

A. THE TRIAL BETWEEN YAHWEH AND ISRAEL

1. Critique of Previous Scholarship

Begrich,[6] followed by Boecker,[7] views Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches, as well as the trial speeches of other prophets, as imitations of forms used in the speeches commonly used in legal proceedings in the town gate. The fact that the prophetic trial speeches, particularly those in Deutero-Isaiah, display a variety of forms which correspond to the forms of the various kinds of utterances used in the town gate--i.e., appeal-to-trial speeches of the accuser, appeal-to-trial speeches of the accused, etc.[8]--signifies that the forms of speeches used in the town gate are imitated and transferred to the relationship between Yahweh and Israel.

---

[6] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 18-41.

[7] Boecker, op. cit.

Von Waldow[9] does not agree that the Sitz im Leben for these speeches is the town gate. The fact that Yahweh is both judge and accuser, a fact inconceivable in the legal life at home in the gate, means that the prophetic trial speeches are at home in some other realm of life. He believes that they are derived from a cultic lawsuit preserved in the Covenant Renewal Festival. Von Waldow takes his cue from Wuerthwein[10] that certain prophetic texts[11] owe their form and content to this cultic lawsuit Gattung.[12] Von Waldow differs from Wuerthwein, who saw these prophetic texts as examples of speeches actually spoken in the cult by the cultic prophet, by viewing the prophetic trial speeches as imitations of the cultic trial speech form.[13] This is the case with the prophetic speeches because Yahweh's appearance as accused rather than accuser in some of them can be explained only if these speeches are imitations of speech-forms used in the cult.

---

[8] Cf. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 19.

[9] von Waldow, Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja, pp. 37-46.

[10] Wuerthwein, "Die Ursprung der prophetischen Gerichtsrede," ZThK 49 (1952), pp. 1-16.

[11] Cf. e.g., Ho. 4:1ff.; Is. 1:2ff., 18-20; 3:13-15; Mal. 3:5.

[12] Wuerthwein views Psalm 50 as one example of this Gattung.

[13] Von Waldow seems to adopt Wuerthwein's conclusion that Psalm 50 is a speech employed at the Covenant Renewal Festival.

The line of argument represented by von Waldow is built up into a new hypothesis that the prophetic trial speeches are "covenant lawsuits" based on the structure of the Sinai covenant, which in turn is derived from the pattern reflected in the Hittite suzerainty treaties.[14] It has even been argued that this prophetic trial speech form can be paralleled in the treaty literature.[15] This "school" of thought is open, however, to severe objections. In the first place, it is unlikely that the Sinai covenant originated in the treaty pattern. It has been demonstrated convincingly, I believe, that the Sinai traditions contained in Exodus 19ff., which contain the most ancient of the Sinai traditions, do not fit the treaty pattern,[16] nor do the treaty stipulations serve as parallels to the covenant commandments.[17] Moreover, the structure of the prophetic trial speeches does not betray its origin in the sphere of international law, as conceived by Julien Harvey,[18] for the prophetic speeches do not fit the following structure: (1) introduction with call to attention and appeal to heaven and earth, (2) interrogation with implicit accusation, (3) indictment, contrasting Yahweh's gracious deeds with Israel's ingratitude, (4) reference to the uselessness of ritual amends, and (5) declaration of guilt and threat of destruction.[19] The forms of the prophetic texts are forced into this pattern, when in fact they do not fit. Isaiah 1, for example, will not fit into this mold. According to Harvey's scheme,[20] Member 1 of the form is found in vv. 2ab-10, Member 2 in vv. 11-12, Member 3 in vv. 2cd-3, 15c, Member 4 in vv. 13-15b, and Member 5 in vv. 16-20. At first glance Harvey's analysis looks suspicious. The formal members of the Gattung delineated by Harvey do not move progressively from one member to another as one might expect. Instead, Members 1 and 3 are each present in two scattered places, and this causes one to wonder whether Isaiah 1 really exhibits the structure hypothesized by Harvey. A closer form critical analysis of the chapter confirms our initial suspicions. Vv. 2-3 are an indictment of Israel in the mouth of Yahweh, addressed to heaven and earth. Vv. 4-9, however, do not constitute a continuation of the formal unit. The prophet, rather than Yahweh, is now the speaker. Furthermore, even though vv. 4-9 begin with a "woe-sentence" in the same way that can be found in many prophetic invectives, the entire speech is not simply an indictment which leads to announcement of future punishment or admonition to change of conduct. Vv. 7-9 seem to refer to a present rather than a future punishment, and this cannot be harmonized with the rîb-pattern as construed by Harvey.[21] Vv. 10-17 begin another formal unit, an imitation of priestly *torah*[22] with Yahweh as the speaker (in contrast to vv. 4-9). Another independent unit is contained in vv. 18-20, a disputation of a false view of the people by Yahweh.[23] Micah 6:1-8 is another example of the so-called "covenant-lawsuit" form that will not fit the mold. Vv. 1-5 reflect the language of the trial, but with Yahweh as accused rather than accuser,[24] and vv. 6-8 are an example of prophetic imitation of priestly *torah.*[25]

---

[14] Cf. e.g., G. Mendenhall, Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East (Pittsburgh: The Presbyterian Board of Colportage of Western Pennsylvania, 1955); K. Baltzer, Das Bundesformular, 2nd ed., WMANT 4 (Neukirchen, Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964). For literature on the "covenant lawsuit," cf. H. Huffmon, "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," JBL 78 (1959), pp. 285-295; G. E. Wright, "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, Ed., Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), pp. 26-67; J. Harvey, "Le 'Rîb-pattern,' requisitoire prophétique sur la rupture d'alliance," Biblica 43 (1962), pp. 172-196; von Waldow, Der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der prophetischen Gerichtsreden.

[15] Harvey, op. cit.

[16] D. J. McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament, Analecta Biblica 21 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), pp. 152ff.

---

[17] E. Gerstenberger, "Covenant and Commandment," JBL 84 (1965), pp. 38-51.

[18] Harvey, op. cit., p. 178.

[19] Or admonition, denoting the change of conduct required by Yahweh.

[20] Harvey, op. cit., p. 178.

---

[21] It is noteworthy that Harvey does not include these verses in his treatment of Isaiah 1.

[22] Cf. Begrich, "Die priesterliche Tora," *BZAW* 66 (Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann, 1936), p. 73.

[23] Cf. Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja*, pp. 26-27. Apart from the question whether or not the appearance of יכח signifies imitation of trial language, it is clear that the speech is disputational. V. 18 contains rhetorical questions, the answer to which is agreed upon by both Yahweh and people. In vv. 19-20 Yahweh extends the argument to apply to the particular situation of dispute.

The treaty pattern aside, von Waldow's view that the prophetic trial speeches are imitations of trial speeches used in the Covenant Renewal Festival cannot be sustained. To be sure, the imagery of Yahweh in a court case with his people Israel is at home in the cult rather than in trial in the gate.[26] But even though the content of the prophetic trial speeches may be derived basically from the cult, the fact remains that the forms of the prophetic trial speeches do not match the forms of the cultic trial speeches from which they are allegedly derived. Psalm 50 cannot serve as an example of the form which the prophets imitate. This psalm does not contain the pattern of invective and punishment-announcement[27] exhibited by many prophetic trial speeches.

---

[24] Huffmon and Harvey miss this important fact.

[25] Begrich, "Die priesterliche Tora," pp. 78ff. To conceive of vv. 6-8 as a part of the trial as does Huffmon (*op. cit.*, p. 287), whether as mocking defense or indignant defense, is the grossest misuse of form criticism.

[26] Cf. Pss. 50, 81.

[27] The traditional term "threat" (*Drohwort*) should probably be replaced by the term "punishment-announcement." The formal element habitually labeled *Drohwort* is not really a threat, but an announcement of evil which will be brought about by Yahweh.

Priestly torah (vv. 14-15)[28] and warning (v. 22), followed again by priestly torah (v. 23),[29] distinguish Psalm 50 quite sharply from the prophetic speeches in question. Moreover, the heavy emphasis on tōdā sets this psalm off from the prophetic speeches. Another oft-suggested example, Psalm 81, cannot serve as an example of a cultic form imitated by the prophets. Although it contains invective,[30] there is no announcement of punishment to be carried out in the future. Instead, the dire consequences have already taken place (v. 13). Since the prophetic trial speeches which are allegedly derived from cultic forms announce punishment which is to come in the future, Psalm 81 cannot serve as an example of that cultic form which serves as the prophets' model.

The position of Begrich and Boecker that the prophetic trial speeches are imitations of speech-forms from trial in the gate is more convincing because they can point to similarities in form. For example, Jeremiah 2:5ff. displays a form found in 1 Samuel 24:10ff. and Judges 11:12-27.[31] This form was employed by the accused in appealing for a hearing of his case before a formally-constituted court, and the formal elements are as follows: (1) reproving question concerning the accusation,[32] (2) assertion of the innocence of the accused,[33] (3) counter-accusation by the accused,[34] and (4) call for a decision at a trial.[35] These elements are present in Jeremiah 2:5ff.: Member 1 is found in v. 5aα; Members 2 and 3 are woven together in vv. 5aβ-8;[36] Member 4 can be recognized in v. 9.[37]

---

[28] Begrich, "Die priesterliche Tora," pp. 72-73.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 75.

[30] Vv. 9ff., particularly v. 12.

[31] Cf. Boecker, *op. cit.*, pp. 48ff.

The fact that some prophetic trial speeches can be shown to be imitations of speech forms used in legal proceedings in the town gate must not lead us to the sweeping generalization that all prophetic trial speeches are therefore derived from that realm of life. In fact, this is the very question which is placed before us in this chapter. Does Deutero-Isaiah follow his prophetic predecessors by imitating the speech-forms known in the town gate in his trial speeches between Yahweh and Israel? If so, does he remain close to the form, or are there significant modifications? Moreover, have we to do with originally isolated and self-contained speeches? Or are they parts of conscious literary compositions? A detailed analysis of each speech is demanded.

---

[32] 1 Sam. 24:10; Ju. 11:12.

[33] 1 Sam. 24:11-12abα; Ju. 11:15-26.

[34] 1 Sam. 24:12bβ; Ju. 11:27a.

[35] 1 Sam. 24:13; Ju. 11:27b.

[36] Member 3 (vv. 5aβ-8); Member 2 (v. 7a).

[37] Cf. Boecker, op. cit., pp. 52-54.

2. Form in Relation to Context

a. 43:22-28. This speech exhibits a speech-form used in the legal procedures of the town gate. It is an appeal-to-trial speech of the accused.[38] The form is known from 1 Samuel 24:10ff. and Judges 11:12ff.: (1) reproving question concerning the accusation, (2) assertion of innocence, (3) counter accusation, and (4) call for decision at a trial. Isaiah 43:22-28 displays the basic form, although Member 1 is missing. The other members are clearly present, however. Member 2 is present in the denial of the accusation that Yahweh had not acted on the behalf of Israel, who deserve such action on the basis of their faithfulness (v. 22-24a). Israel, says Yahweh, has not in fact been faithful. Then comes the counter accusation:

> In fact (אך), you burdened me with your sins,
> You wearied me with your iniquities (v. 24b).

Next appears the summons for decision at a trial (v.26).[39] Then further accusation follows (vv. 27-28).

---

[38] Cf. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 23-26; Boecker, op. cit., pp. 48-56.

[39] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 26; B.S. Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel, SBT 37 (London: S.C.M. Press, 1962), pp. 14-15.

Although Isaiah 43:22-28 exhibits the appeal-to-trial form, it is an imitation of that form. Yahweh would not be the accused in a real trial in the town gate. Furthermore, the emphatic statement of Yahweh's mercy in v. 25 would have no place in a real trial in the town gate. A real trial occurs for the purpose of deciding the truth of an accusation. Thus an announcement of mercy by the accused is conceivable only in an imitation of the real speech-form. Another factor which indicates that Isaiah 43:22-28 is an imitation is the inclusion of language from institutions other than trial in the gate. The accusation which is denied by Yahweh is not really a legal accusation. Instead, the charge which Yahweh answers is a complaint (Klage) uttered by Israel, substantiated by their claim of having been faithful. The *Sitz im Leben* of such a complaint is the cultic lament psalm rather than the legal realm.[40] In the real setting of the cultic lament psalm the complaint is not answered by a trial speech but by a salvation oracle.[41] In prophetic tradition, however, the cultic complaint is sometimes treated as if it were a legal accusation against Yahweh. Thus the answering speech of Yahweh takes the form of a legal speech.[42] In

---

[40] The relationship of Isaiah 43:22-28 to the cultic complaint was suggested to me by Westermann, *Sprache und Struktur*, p. 142.

[41] H. Gunkel, *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, 2nd. ed. (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966), p. 246; Begrich, "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel," *ZAW* 52 (1934), pp. 81-92, and *Studien zu Deuterojesaja*, pp. 6-18.

[42] Cf. e.g., Je. 2:5ff.; Mi. 6:1-5.

Isaiah 43:22-28 Deutero-Isaiah also makes use of this common prophetic practice by dealing with Israel's complaint and assertion of righteousness as if it were a legal accusation. The speech of Yahweh takes the form, as we have seen, of an appeal-to-trial speech of the accused.

In spite of the continuity of this speech with the practice of Deutero-Isaiah's prophetic predecessors, it is apparent that the speech exhibits the particular marks of Deutero-Isaiah's preaching in the circumstances of the exile. This Deutero-Isaianic stamp is visible in both form and content. Isaiah 43: 22-28 does not function simply to defend Yahweh against a false accusation, as in Micah 6:1-5, nor is the main thrust of the speech to indict and announce punishment for Yahweh's accusers, as in Jeremiah 2:5ff. Although the elements of legal self-defense and counter-accusation are present in this speech as a part of the speech-form, the main concern of Deutero-Isaiah is to dispute Israel's right to expect a positive answer to their complaint and plea on the basis of their righteousness. Deutero-Isaiah argues that they have no righteousness; the exile is deserved (vv. 22-24a, 27-28). Deliverance can come only by forgiveness granted for the sake of Yahweh's name (v. 25). Continuing to employ the trial as a means for carrying out the dispute, Deutero-Isaiah has Yahweh challenge Israel (by means of a summons to trial) to refute his assertions argued in vv. 22-25 and to prove that they are a righteous people. Thus Deutero-Isaiah modifies the appeal-to-trial form to suit the purposes of his disputation by including the non-legal v. 25. The theological dispute concerning the basis for Israel's future deliverance, a characteristic feature of the exilic preaching of Deutero-Isaiah (e.g., 40:2; 44:22),[43] can be explained only from the circumstances of the exile. Thus the content of the speech and Deutero-Isaiah's imitation and transformation of the appeal-to-trial form are a result of his own reshaping of traditional material.

Summing up our results thus far, we have discovered that in Isaiah 43:22-28 the prophet imitates a form known from the legal tradition in the town gate as the mold into which he casts his dispute with the people. He follows his prophetic predecessors by using a trial form as a vehicle for a disputational answer to a complaint whose provenance is the cultic complaint psalm. But his own contribution can be seen, not only in the content of what he has to say, but also in his modification of the form as seen in v. 25.

In spite of the fact that the form is to a certain extent the creation of Deutero-Isaiah, it is not justifiable to draw the conclusion that form critical methodology can no longer provide the proper controls in dealing with the relationship of these verses to the larger context. Even though the stamp of Deutero-Isaiah is evident in both form and content, one must not forget that 43:22-28 is a trial speech throughout in contrast to the surrounding context, which is cast in the form of salvation oracles.[44] In this sense the speech stands out from its context as a formal unit. A discussion of the relationship of this speech to its context cannot profitably ignore the fact that it can be isolated by form critical methodology.

---

[43] Cf. also 48:1-11.

The form critical independence of these verses does not necessarily imply, however, that there is no relationship to the context, whether that relationship be original as a part of a longer composition or secondary as a result of the work of a collector. In fact, there seem to be certain connecting features. The verb זכר appears in both 43:22-28 (vv. 25, 26) and the preceding context (v. 18). Furthermore, there appears to be an intentional shift from language about Israel whose purpose is to praise Yahweh (v. 21) to the Israel who did not give Yahweh proper praise (vv. 22ff.)[45] 43: 22-28 is related also to the following context, not only by the presence in both of "Jacob-Israel" (43:22, 28; 44:1), but also the fact that 43: 22-28 speaks of sinful ancestors (vv. 27-28) in contrast to a promise of posterity on whom God's Spirit will be poured (44:3).[46] Another hint that 43: 22-28 is related to its context in a meaningful way is the fact that Deutero-Isaiah appears to have a pattern of the alternation of trial speeches and salvation oracles.[47] This is probably not accidental.

---

[44] 43:14-21; 44:1-5. Cf. Chapter IV.

[45] Cf. George A. F. Knight, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Theological Commentary on Isaiah 40-55* (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 105.

[46] Westermann, *Das Buch Jesaja: Kapitel 40-66, ATD,* Teilband 19 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966), p. 110.

The fact that we have not yet examined the salvation oracles form critically prompts us to delay further examination of the question of the context of 43: 22-28 until we analyze the salvation oracles which form its context.

b. 50:1-3. Many scholars, most of whom see this passage as a part of a larger poem, regard it as an indictment of Israel throughout.[48] Reacting against the belief of the people that they have been sold for debts and that their mother has been divorced by Yahweh, Yahweh declares that their sin, not Yahweh's arbitrary acts, is responsible for their having been sold and their mother having been sent away. Then follows in v. 2, according to this approach, a reproach of the people for their lack of faith. Why did they not believe when Yahweh "came" through his prophet? Did they think he could not save?

Recent form critics have not only viewed these verses as an independent speech unit but also have offered a new interpretation.

---

[47] Cf. 41:1-29; 43:8-44:5.

[48] Cf. e.g., Max Haller, Das Judentum, 2nd. ed., revised, SAT 2/3 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1925), pp. 56-57; E. J. Kissane, The Book of Isaiah, Vol. II (Dublin: The Richview Press, 1943), p. 139; James Muilenburg, The Interpreter's Bible, Ed. George Arthur Buttrick, Vol. V (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), p. 581.

Begrich[49] and von Waldow (in his second treatment of the problem)[50] view vv. 1-2aα as an imitation of a speech-form from trial in the gate. It is the form used by the accused in speaking before the court. Begrich outlines the form of the speech of the accused before the court as follows: (1) reproving question to opponents concerning the validity of the charge,[51] and (2) assertion of innocence by the accused, often in the form of a recital of his righteous deeds[52] or in the form of a catalogue of the unrighteousness of his accuser.[53] Begrich notes that there is considerable variety in the form. All of the elements do not necessarily have to be present, and they may appear in different sequence. This is because of the variety of situations which could occur in the town gate.

For Begrich and von Waldow, Isaiah 50:1-2aα displays the structure of this trial Gattung. (1) The reproving question appears in v. 1a. (2) The assertion of the innocence of the accused is in the form of a counter-accusation (v. 1b). After having presented his case in

---

[49] Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 31-32.

[50] Der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der prophetischen Gerichtsreden, pp. 42ff.

[51] Cf. Je. 2:29; Mi. 6:3; Jo. 4:4.

[52] Cf. Mi. 6:4-5.

[53] Cf. Je. 2:29-30; Jo. 4:5-6.

v. 1, the accused then finds himself without accusers:

> Why did I come and there was no man?
> Why did I call without anyone answering?

The terms בוא , קרא, and ענה are to be understood as technical legal terms.[54]

Both Begrich and von Waldow argue, however, that vv. 1-3 are not a slavish imitation of the speech of the accused in the gate. Von Waldow recognizes that the form is broken in the second part of v. 2 and v. 3, but he does not explain the significance of the modification in form. Begrich, however, views the speech as a whole (vv. 1-3) as a disputation speech. Vv. 1-2aα are cast in the form of a trial speech by means of which Yahweh disputes the claim of the people that he has forsaken them. Vv. 2aβ -3, in the form of a disputation which does not employ the imagery of the trial, dispute the claim that Yahweh is not able to save.

The dividing line between the form critics, who view this passage as an independent unit drawn from the trial, and those who do not follow this approach is clear. Since form critical analysis, in my opinion, has been helpful in our discussion of Deutero-Isaiah's speeches up to this point in our research, let us begin with a critique of that approach to these verses. The form critics have been correct, I believe, in viewing

---

[54] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 32.

vv. 1-2aα from the standpoint of the trial. The reproving question followed by the assertion of the innocence of the accused and/or the guilt of the accuser has firm roots in trial language in speeches of the accused.[55] The repeated occurrence in the Old Testament of בוא, קרא, and ענה as technical terms from trial language is reflected here.[56] Finally, the appearance of language similar to v. 2a in another place in Deutero-Isaiah, in which the trial is clearly reflected (41:26b, 28), is another indication that 50:1-2aα draws upon the language of the trial.

I doubt, however, that we can be so precise as to say that this is an imitation of a form used in the gate by the accused in speaking before the assembled court. To be sure, it has been argued that the lack of an appeal for trial indicates that Deutero-Isaiah is imitating a speech-form used before an already-assembled court.[57] But the fact that vv. 2aβ -3 cannot successfully be included within the strict confines of a trial speech form makes it doubtful that we can make such fine distinctions. It is better to be content with saying that Deutero-Isaiah imitates language used by the accused. Furthermore, it is doubtful that we can even say that Deutero-Isaiah was thinking particularly of forms used in the gate. He might simply be following the practice of his prophetic predecessors, who use the reproving question and counter-accusation of the speech of the accused as a vehicle for Yahweh's dealing with the people's complaints.

---

[55] Cf. e.g., Ju. 11:12-27; 1 Sam. 24:10ff.; Je. 2:5ff.; Is. 43:22-28.

[56] Cf. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 32, for statistics.

[57] von Waldow, Der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der prophetischen Gerichtsreden, p. 42.

A closer look at the form of vv. 1-3 as a whole will show clearly, I believe, that Deutero-Isaiah imitates trial language, but with a great deal of freedom to transform and fuse speech-forms. Begrich is correct that vv. 1-3 form a disputation speech in which only vv. 1-2aα imitate trial language. The disputation falls into two parts, each beginning with a question and proceeding to a statement introduced by הן :

> Where is your mother's certificate of divorce with which I sent her away?
> Or to which of my creditors have I sold you?
> Behold (הן), for your iniquities were you sold, and for your transgressions was your mother sent away.
>
> Is my hand made short, that it cannot save? Or have I no power to deliver?
> Behold (הן), by my rebuke I dry up the sea . . . .

The questions contain the matter which is disputed. In the first half of this speech, the question imitating the reproving question of the accused refers to the complaint at home in the cult, "Yahweh has divorced our mother and sold us to pay his debts." In the second half, the question refers to the view that Yahweh is powerless to save. The statements introduced by הן counter the false view of the people and contain the resolution of the dispute. In the first half of this speech, the reproving question of the speech of the accused demands that the people produce evidence against Yahweh. Since they cannot produce it, Yahweh can state his own claim (v. 1b) without further objection. In the case of the second question, Yahweh appeals to what every Israelite knows from tradition about Yahweh (vv. 2aβ -3). The opponents of Yahweh's claim are left to draw the proper conclusion for themselves.

This double-barreled disputation, in which one part is an imitation of trial speech, has no *Sitz im Leben* outside the preaching of Deutero-Isaiah. His free combination of trial forms within the larger framework of the disputation has no roots apart from Deutero-Isaiah's own creativity. Furthermore, the use of disputation to counter doubts both about Yahweh's faithfulness and about his power to save is common throughout Deutero-Isaiah. 50:1-3, in my opinion, is a case in which Deutero-Isaiah has created a disputation on both doubts, and in doing so he has freely combined and transformed traditional speech forms.

Since Deutero-Isaiah has apparently reshaped traditional *Gattungen* to suit the needs of his preaching, we have no *a priori* reason to isolate vv. 1-3 as a formal unit. In fact, we must now ask concerning the limits of the speech unit. Turning first to the following verses, we must decide whether vv. 4ff. belong with vv. 1-3. Muilenburg

[58] considers vv. 1-11 as a unit. The dual questions answered by statements introduced by הן in vv. 1-3 are climaxed by two questions introduced by מי (vv. 9, 10), each of which is answered by a statement introduced by הן (vv. 9, 11). It is not immediately clear, however, whether these stylistic similarities signify compositional unity. One might as easily suppose that הן used twice in response to two questions is a catchword principle used by a collector. We can begin more profitably by asking whether there is a form critical connection between vv. 1-3 and vv. 4ff.

Vv. 1-3, introduced by כה אמר יהוה, are given as a speech of Yahweh, and this speech is directed to a masculine plural audience. This audience is depicted as exiled children of a mother who has been divorced. These three verses attempt to deal with the two questions, "Has Yahweh forsaken us?" and, "Is Yahweh able to help us?" Vv. 1-3 can be described form critically as a disputation speech in the mouth of Yahweh on these two questions. Vv. 4ff. exhibit a different form. Yahweh no longer speaks, but rather the Servant. Furthermore, the speech of the Servant does not continue the dispute reflected in vv. 1-3. He does not argue against Yahweh's claim in v. 1b that he is righteous. In fact, his claim to righteousness is not disputed by Yahweh. Instead, Yahweh is the one who helps him to righteousness in the trial (vv. 7-9a). This contrasts with the relationship of the parties in the trial in vv. 1-2aα .

---

[58] Muilenburg, op. cit., pp. 578ff.

Muilenburg chooses to argue his case along a different line. The connection between vv. 1-3 and vv. 4ff. is not along form critical lines. The connection is rather to show the contrast between the faithless in Israel (vv. 1-3) and the faithful Servant (vv. 4ff). Perhaps Muilenburg's view cannot be disproved, but neither can it be proved. The connections between vv. 1-3 and vv. 4ff. are supplied by Muilenburg rather than the text. This fact alone suggests that we must be hesitant in accepting Muilenburg's position. Moreover, the fact that vv. 1-3 are not primarily an indictment but rather a disputation to show Yahweh's faithfulness and power to save casts doubt on Muilenburg's theory of the relationship to vv. 1-3 and vv. 4ff. as a contrast between the indicted faithless ones and the faithful Servant. Therefore, I suggest that vv. 1-3 and vv. 4ff. are only secondarily joined.

Turning now to the preceding context, we are faced immediately with the problem of the anterior limits of that context. Are we to begin with 49:14, where the language about Zion and her children begins, or should we begin with v. 24?[59] If we use the larger context, we find immediately that 49:14ff. agrees with 50:1-3 in dealing with the subject matter of a mother and her children. Moreover, 50:1-3 shares with 49:14ff. a disputational quality. Certain very real differences exist, however. 49:14ff. differs from 50:1-3 in that it consistently has second person feminine singular address to Zion instead of the masculine plural of the people. Moreover, 49:14ff. has at its roots a Gattung which has nothing to do with the trial--the salvation oracle.[60] In addition, 49:14ff. pictures the mother Zion as located in her original geographical place as a mother whose children have been taken away and are to be returned--an example of Deutero-Isaiah's particular manifestation of an old tradition that involves the pilgrimage of the nations to Zion.[61] In 50:1-3, however, the mother is portrayed as having been sent away, and these verses, in contrast to 49:14ff., are quite specific concerning the reason for the exile of both mother and children. Furthermore, it is not clear in 50:1-3, again in contrast to 49:14ff., whether the mother is Zion. The similarities in imagery with Hosea 2 and Jeremiah 3, particularly Jeremiah 3:8, leave open the possibility that the city Zion is not meant at all, but perhaps Judah or even Jerusalem in a non-Zion framework of tradition. But even if Zion is meant, the image of the mother as "sent away" reflects a difference from 49:14ff. Another contrast is the nature of the disputation in each passage. Although both 49:14ff. and 50:1-3 reflect the element of disputation, the disputational quality of 49:14ff. is centered exclusively on the question whether Yahweh will return Zion's children to her. There is no indictment of her children for sin. In 50:1-3, however, the matter of the people's sin is central to the disputation.

---

[59] Cf. Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja*, p. 5.

---

[60] Cf. Chapter IV.

[61] Cf. G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. II, trans. by D.M.G. Stalker (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), pp. 239-240, 293ff.

Even if we consider only 49:24-26 as the limits of the preceding context, the form critical difference between salvation oracle ending with the Erkenntnis formula (49:24-26)[62] and disputation speech containing a trial speech (50:1-3) is still present. Zion is addressed in the former and the children in the latter. To be sure, both 49:24-26 and 50:1-3 both presuppose the exile, but it is viewed in different ways. In 49:24-26 the focus is on the fact that Yahweh can and will deliver his children from the tyrant and will punish the enemies of Zion's sons. In 50:1-3, different imagery is present. We no longer have to do with the tyrant, nor is there concern for punishment of the oppressor. Instead, we have before us a reflection on the charges that Yahweh has abandoned his people and that he is powerless to save. Even though the latter charge is similar to 49:24-26, the imagery is different. Instead of language about the tyrant and the oppressor, we find language from the mythical chaos battle.

The discontinuities of 50:1-3 with the preceding context suggest the likelihood that the connection is secondary and non-kerygmatic. The subject matter of mother and children is a means of association, but the differences in the use of this subject matter suggest that the present juxtaposition is due to the work of a collector.

---

[62] Cf. Walther Zimmerli, Erkenntnis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezechiel, ATANT 27 (Zuerich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1954).

B. THE TRIAL BETWEEN YAHWEH AND THE NATIONS

1. Form and *Sitz*: Critique of Scholarship

Begrich views the trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations or their gods as imitations of various forms from trial in the gate.[63] In his view, these Deutero-Isaianic speeches betray different forms which correspond to various kinds of speeches used in the legal life of the town gate. Begrich is correct in labeling these speeches "trial speeches." It seems clear that these speeches reflect the gathering of an assembly for the purpose of making a legally-binding decision.[64] But there are certain difficulties with his position. Almost all the non-Deutero-Isaianic trial speeches discussed by Begrich have to do with violation of the established order--theft of gods (Gn. 31), violence done to the clan mother (Gn. 16), etc. But Deutero-Isaiah's speeches involving Yahweh and the nations or their gods reflect rival claims to deity, not disruption of the established order. In these

---

[63] Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja*, p. 19.

[64] For example, the nations are summoned to draw near for משפט (41:1; cf. Ju. 4:5; Mal. 3:5); the gods are summoned to bring near their ריב (41:21); witnesses are to be produced by each side (43:9, 10; 44:8).

Deutero-Isaianic speeches the court does not restore the violated order by a verdict of "guilty" or "innocent" or by restitution of rights which have been violated. Instead, the court determines which of the opposing parties has proved the truth of his assertion. To be sure, Begrich is not totally unaware of this difference in Deutero-Isaiah's speeches, but he views the differences in Deutero-Isaiah as variants of the basic form.[65]

The forms of these Deutero-Isaianic texts, however, do not conform to the forms of speeches known in the town gate as clearly as Begrich believes. For example, the appeal-to-trial speech of the accuser in the town gate often contained a question in which the accusation is present: i.e., "Why have you done this thing?"[66] Also the accuser often speaks of the punishment which he believes is the proper outcome of the trial.[67] Or instead of appearing as a question, the accusation is sometimes in the form of a statement.[68] Isaiah 41:1ff.--in Begrich's view an appeal-to-trial speech of the accuser--simply is not parallel. To be sure, v. 1 contains a summons to trial, but there the similarity ends. The questions in vv. 2-4 are not at all parallel to those contained in Jeremiah 26:9 and 1 Samuel 26:15. They are disputational questions rather than questions for the purposes of making accusation.[69]

---

[65] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 22-28.

[66] Cf. Je. 26:9; 1 Sam. 26:15. Boecker, op. cit., pp. 58-59.

[67] Cf. Je. 26:8; 1 Sam. 26:16. Boecker, op. cit., pp. 58-59.

[68] Cf. Gn. 16:5. Boecker, op. cit., pp. 59-61.

Von Waldow,[70] as in the speeches between Yahweh and Israel, views the trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations as imitations of speech-forms employed in the cult. Form critically, they distinguish themselves from trial in the gate by the fact that Yahweh is both accuser and judge. They are prophetic imitations of the trial speech-form used in the Covenant Renewal Festival, in which Yahweh judges unfaithful Israel. In the Deutero-Isaianic speeches between Yahweh and the nations, the original cultic form is modified to a considerable degree. First of all, the role of Yahweh as judge stands out more in Deutero-Isaiah than in the cult or in imitations of this form by other prophets. This is caused by Deutero-Isaiah's use of the imagery of the enthronement of Yahweh as king and judge of the nations. A second modification is that the nations and their gods are the accused instead of Israel. In the third place, modification is to be seen in the fact that Deutero-Isaiah's speeches come very close to disputation style. The similarity with disputation style is the result of the prophet's need to convince a doubting people of the reality of Yahweh's power as king over the nations.

---

[69] Note that the disputation style in 41:1ff. is for the purpose of arguing to a conclusion (v. 4b). The conclusion is based on a deduction drawn from a point of agreement between Yahweh and hearers (v. 4a).

[70] Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja, pp. 37-46.

Von Waldow is surely correct that the content of these speeches is similar to imagery preserved in the cult. The Psalms are well acquainted with the court scene involving the nations and their gods.[71] Moreover, Yahweh's appearing as king (Isaiah 41:21) is characteristic of the cult. Finally, the fact that cultic features are strong in Deutero-Isaiah, such as hymnic style and the imagery of the cultic procession, lends a certain degree of credibility to the idea of strong cultic influence on Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches.

Nevertheless, the Deutero-Isaianic speeches differ markedly from such trial material preserved in the cult. In the cult, Yahweh is always sovereign as judge over the nations and their gods. This sovereignty is never questioned. Yahweh's role in the cult is to re-establish the order which has been disrupted. In Deutero-Isaiah, however, the trial is called to determine whether or not Yahweh is God. The possibility that he might not be sovereign is taken seriously. Therefore, the trial deals with rival claims to deity, not violations of the established order. In addition to these differences in content between

---

[71] Cf. e.g., Pss. 75; 82; 96:10, 13; 98:9. Cf. S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, Vol. I, trans. by D.R. Ap-Thomas (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), pp. 148ff.

Deutero-Isaiah and the cultic material, it is unlikely that the form can be derived from the trial between Yahweh and Israel as preserved in the Covenant Renewal Festival. The supposed modifications are staggering. The nations and their gods are the opposing parties rather than Israel. The situation is one of genuine dispute rather than one in which Yahweh acts as sovereign judge over his own disobedient people. Another supposed formal modification is the incorporation of disputation style. Surely such a complex modification of a speech-form is not credible.

In the Deutero-Isaianic speeches which Boecker discusses,[72] he agrees basically with Begrich in viewing these trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations as imitations of forms used in the town gate. But he is sensitive to the fact that there is no accuser and accused in the usual sense of the term. Isaiah 41:1ff. is not a speech of an accuser summoning to trial those who have transgressed the established order. Instead the trial is called to settle conflicting assertions, which revolve around the question, "Who aroused one from the east...?" Therefore, postulates Boecker, this speech is not an appeal-to-trial speech of the accused in Begrich's sense of the term. In fact, says Boecker, it is a Gattung which he calls an appeal speech for a trial to determine the truth of an assertion. It has its own form, which is found also in Isaiah 1:18-20.[73]

---

[72] Boecker discusses only 41:1ff. and 44:6-8 (op. cit., pp. 69-70, 162-163).

Boecker is correct that Isaiah 41:1ff. does not fit Begrich's view of the form from the town gate. But one wonders why Boecker considers it as a speech-form at home in the town gate. Neither Isaiah 1:18-20 nor 41:1ff. reflects the kind of dispute which would be settled in the town gate--in terms of content at least.[74] Moreover, there is no evidence that the form of the kind of appeal speech postulated by Boecker is at home in the gate.

Boecker's arguments for a Sitz im Leben in the gate are stronger, however, for 44:6-8.[75] This speech, he argues, can be illuminated by passages such as Ruth 4:1-12, which is an accurate portrayal of a typical situation in which witnesses are called to notarize a legal transaction in the event that their testimony is needed at a future date. Boaz summons the witnesses by means of the following formula: עדים אתם היום כי קנית... (v. 9). Isaiah 44:6-8, Boecker argues, imitates the language from such a setting. Yahweh states the claim which he wants the assembly to confirm as witnesses: "I am the first and the last; besides me there is no God" (v. 6b). Those who oppose this claim are challenged to state their case (v. 7). The challenge goes unanswered, however, so Yahweh summons the witnesses to validate the establishment of his claim: ואתם עדי (v. 8).

---

[73] Boecker, op. cit., pp. 68-70.

[74] The former has to do with a dispute between Yahweh and the people over the consequences of sin. The latter is a dispute whether Yahweh is God.

[75] Boecker, op. cit., pp. 160ff.

A more detailed analysis of this passage will be presented below, but a brief critique of Boecker's position can be outlined here. The presence of the formula ואתם עדי is an indication, I believe, that the prophet is indeed drawing on a Gattung from trial in the gate. But this Gattung from the town gate is not as all-encompassing an influence in 44:6-8 as Boecker seems to believe. The presence of אל תפחדו ואל תרהו[76] is an element which does not fit our trial Gattung from the town gate. Moreover, the "proof" for Yahweh's claim appears in the form of a disputation which is designed to convince doubters of the truth of Yahweh's claim. In the style of a question introduced by מי and assertions in self-praise hymnic style,[77] which is typical of both Deutero-Isaiah's disputation and trial speeches,[78] Yahweh appeals to common knowledge that his prophetic word has been effective in the past (v. 8aβ) in order to convince his opponents that he alone is God and thus responsible for arousing Cyrus. This disputation style is not confined to trial speeches.[79] Therefore, the disputational language of 44:6-8 has a degree of independence which cannot easily be considered simply a modification of a Gattung from trial in the town gate.

---

[76] We should probably read the second verb as a form of ירא.

[77] Cf. my discussion in Chapter II.

[78] 41:1ff., 21-29; 43:8-13; 44:6-8; 45:18-21; 46:5-11; 48:12-15.

[79] 46:5-11 is not a trial speech. Moreover, a somewhat similar disputation style is present in 40:18-24, 25-26, neither of which is a trial speech.

The difficulty in showing that Isaiah 41:1ff. is an imitation of a Gattung whose Sitz im Leben is the town gate, coupled with the fact that a Gattung from the gate does not appear to be the only Gattung present in 44:6-8, forces us to ask whether Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches are imitations of one Gattung with a real Sitz im Leben in Israel's life, as Boecker seems to believe.

Westermann,[80] who is concerned with the question raised immediately above, denies that Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations are derived from a Gattung which has a real setting in Israel's life. A trial to determine whether or not Yahweh is God has no Sitz im Leben in Israel; in fact, such a thing, says Westermann, would be unthinkable. Moreover, Westermann believes that the form of Deutero-Isaiah's speeches betrays a stylizing which does not permit the delineation of a structure beyond the following general categories: (1) Vorladung, (2) Verhandlung, and (3) Entscheidung. A more exact imitation of forms from another realm of life is in Westermann's opinion not the case. This is true because the stylizing is the work of the prophet himself. Although Westermann presumably would not reject the notion that in a very limited sense the prophet borrowed language from trial Gattungen at home somewhere in Israel's life, his concern is to show that the bulk of form and content is due to the prophet's literary creativity. This stylized structure was created by Deutero-Isaiah, says Westermann, as a response to the need to convince doubting Israel that the emergence of the pagan Cyrus was to be understood as a new event in Israel's salvation history.

---

[80] Sprache und Struktur, pp. 135ff.

The difficulties with the positions of Begrich, von Waldow, and Boecker make Westermann's view attractive. A certain stylizing peculiar to Deutero-Isaiah seems to be present indeed. Moreover, previous attempts to find a Sitz im Leben have not been successful. But Westermann states his case without examining these speeches carefully enough. For example, he has failed to inquire concerning the significance of the disputational language in these speeches. Could it be that this style unlocks the door to a form critical understanding of these speeches? Or, as a possible alternative, Westermann's statement that a trial to determine whether Yahweh is God has no place in Israel's life is open to doubt. The narrative of the assembly on Mt. Carmel in 1 Kings 18 has striking similarities with Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches. Could it be that both the Mt. Carmel assembly and Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches are derived from a common source in Israel's life--namely a trial to determine whether Yahweh is God?

These possibilities necessitate the re-opening of the question of form and Sitz im Leben. In so doing, we shall evaluate various possibilities separately.

2. Form and Sitz: A Constructive Quest

a. Turning first to the relationship between Deutero-Isaiah's speeches with Yahweh over against the nations or their gods and the narrative of the assembly on Mt. Carmel,[81] certain resemblances are immediately apparent. First of all, there is a similarity in situation. Both reflect a crisis in confidence in the lordship of Yahweh, and in both an assembly is summoned to determine whether Yahweh is God. In addition, certain structural similarities are apparent. Both have a summons to assembly.[82] In both, each deity is supposed to justify its claim before the assembly--in 1 Kings 18 by producing fire, in Deutero-Isaiah by demonstrating an ability to utter a word about the future which comes to pass.

---

[81] The scene at Mt. Carmel was originally a narrative independent from the present context. The drought is not a part of the original Mt. Carmel narrative. The Mt. Carmel narrative is connected with the drought by the collector of chapters 17-19, who uses the drought as punishment for Ahab's sin as a unifying motif in the collection. Even the Obadiah narrative does not belong originally to the Mt. Carmel narrative. It is a connecting link between the calling of the assembly and the motif of drought and rain-making. Cf. the following literature: H. Gunkel, Elias, Jahve, und Baal (Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1906); A. Alt, "Das Gottesurteil auf dem Karmel," Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 2nd. ed., Band 2 (Muenchen: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1964), pp. 135-149; G. Fohrer, Elia, ATANT 31 (Zuerich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1957); E. Wuerthwein, "Die Erzaehlung vom Gottesurteil auf dem Karmel," ZThK 59 (1962), pp. 131-144.

Admitting the formal difference between 1 Kings 18 as a narrative and the Deutero-Isaianic material as speeches of Yahweh as a party in the trial, can we say that both are derived from a common setting of a trial between Yahweh and opposing deities (or their people)?

---

[82] Is. 41:1, 21; 43:8; 44:7; 45:20; 48:14; 1 Kings 18:19. This verse contains elements that do not appear to be a part of the original Mt. Carmel narrative. The mention of the four hundred prophets of Asherah who eat at Jezebel's table is derived from the larger framework of chapters 17-19; elsewhere in the Mt. Carmel narrative only the four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal are mentioned. Moreover, the command in v. 19 is directed to Ahab, who may be a part of the narrative only after it was connected with the motif of drought as punishment for Ahab's sin (cf. Wuerthwein, op. cit., p. 132). Finally, the phrase "all Israel" appears only in this verse, along with the expression "all the people of Israel" in v. 20, a verse which has perhaps been reworked by the collector of chapters 17-19 in order to fit Ahab into the narrative. The rest of the narrative speaks of the assembly as "all the people." There is a strong possibility that vv. 19-20 show the heavy hand of the collector, who inserts Ahab into the narrative and refers to the people as "Israel." (In 19:14, obviously dependent traditionally upon 18:10, 22, and thus the work of the collector of chapters 17-19, the phrase "all the people of Israel" appears.) Nevertheless, vv. 19-20 preserve some elements of the original narrative. There must have been a summons to assembly and a narration that the parties were assembled. Moreover, the presence of Mt. Carmel as the place of assembly and the mention of the four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal seem to be original to the narrative. Thus it is probable that the Mt. Carmel narrative originally contained a summons, now reworked by the collector.

If this should be true, it would be necessary to show that both the Mt. Carmel narrative and the Deutero-Isaianic speeches are really a trial, and that the trial in each reflects the same basic form. It is precisely at this point that we encounter difficulties. Deutero-Isaiah's speeches, as we have already seen, are clearly trial speeches.[83] But the Mt. Carmel narrative cannot accurately be called a trial. No legal terminology is present, nor is there any talk of witnesses. In fact, the Mt. Carmel narrative describes a setting more closely related to a contest than to a trial. If one compares 1 Kings 18 with the narrative of the court-page David with Goliath in 1 Samuel 17,[84] certain common elements are apparent. Both have to do with the performing of certain feats; both have a challenge to the opposing party as to the nature of the feats to be performed (1 Sam. 17: 8, 9; 1 Kings 18:23-24); both have a statement of the consequences of the contest (1 Sam. 17:9; 1 Kings 18:24). In both narratives, the party with whose cause the sympathy of the narrator lies operates at a clear disadvantage, with the result that his triumph is even more impressive.

---

[83] Cf. above, footnote 64.

[84] I am following the analysis of H. Gressmann that 1 Sam. 17 is a fusion of two originally separate narratives--the narrative reflecting David as a shepherd sent to bring food to his brothers (vv. 12-14, 17-30, 41, 48b, 50, 55-58) and the narrative of David as a page in Saul's court (vv. 1-11, 31-40, 42-48a, 49, 51-53; 18:1, 3-5). Cf. Gressmann, Die aelteste Geschichtsschreibung und die Prophetie Israels, SAT 2/1 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910), pp. 77ff.

Not only is there no trace of a trial in the Mt. Carmel narrative, but also there is no indication of a contest in the speeches of Deutero-Isaiah. No feats are performed. In fact, Deutero-Isaiah's speeches present an *argument* designed to convince doubters that Yahweh is God. To be sure, the opposing side is to demonstrate that the gods can prophesy and have their words come true (41:22; 43:9; 44:7), and in one case there is an explicit invitation to perform acts that befit deity (41:22-23). But the performing of these deeds does not actually take place in these speeches. Instead, Yahweh presents an argument which appeals to his past record of prophesying the future.

There is little doubt that Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations and the Mt. Carmel narrative draw upon a common motif. There is no evidence, however, for speaking of a common *Gattung*, but simply a motif which can appear in different settings, i.e., the contest, the trial. Thus we cannot establish a trial to determine deity as an already-existing *Gattung* which Deutero-Isaiah employs. Nevertheless, we must not fail to recognize the incorporation of a generally-known motif into a trial framework.

b. The element of disputation has already been mentioned as a strong feature in Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations. The disputational nature of these speeches is not simply a matter of content, but also of form, as we shall see presently. The question before us is the role which this disputational language plays.

Can we discover a trial *Gattung* in which this kind of disputation plays an integral role? Or is the combination of trial and disputational style an arbitrary fusion performed by Deutero-Isaiah himself?

Our analysis of this disputational language in Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches must proceed in full view of the fact that the dispute whether Yahweh is God is carried on in similar style in the disputation speeches proper. In fact, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between trial speeches and disputation speeches. 45:18ff. and 48: 12-15 are labeled disputation speeches by Begrich[85] and von Waldow,[86] while the former is regarded as a trial speech by Westermann.[87] I consider these two speeches to be trial speeches because of what appears to be a summons to trial in each (45:20a; 48:14aα).[88]

The disputational elements in Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches make up the content of Yahweh's legal case. That is to say, Yahweh's case is presented as an argument which appeals to a basis of common agreement as a means of convincing the hearers of the truth of the speaker's disputed claim. The disputational elements in these Deutero-Isaianic speeches are highly stylized. They all contain a question (or questions) introduced by מי , and the answer to this question is the key to the resolution of the dispute. In 41:21-29, for example, the answer to the rhetorical question,[89] "Who declared from the beginning?" makes it possible for the speaker to move from this point of common agreement to resolve the dispute. Or, in 41:1ff., the first question introduced by מי is the disputed question (v. 2), and the answer to the rhetorical question introduced by מי (v. 4a) leads the hearers to the proper answer to the first question (v. 4b). In most of them, the speech is closed by an assertion by Yahweh in first-person self-praise hymnic style,[90] or by self-praise hymnic style in the form of a rhetorical question (45:21), although other ways exist, such as statements introduced by הן (41:29). Differences in structure cannot be ignored. The various parts of these speeches are arranged differently. Nevertheless, the content and disputational style are stereotyped to a high degree.

---

[85] *Studien zu Deuterojesaja*, p. 42.

[86] *Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja*, p. 36.

[87] *Sprache und Struktur*, pp. 136ff.

[88] In 48:12-15 the shift from singular to plural address probably indicates that Yahweh has turned from Israel to the nations. Addresses to the nations do not occur elsewhere in Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches. The imperatives of קבץ in 45:20 and 48:14 (cf. also 43:9) and נגש in 45:20 (cf. also 41:1, 21) are probably indications of trial language.

The stylized structure of questions introduced by מי and self-praise hymnic style is also used by Deutero-Isaiah apart from the trial, as the disputation speech 46:5-11 shows. Furthermore, the purpose of the disputation speeches proper is the same as that of the trial speeches--to demonstrate that Yahweh is God.[91]

---

[89] The question is rhetorical for an Israelite audience.

[90] Cf. e.g., 41:4b; 43:11-13.

We are now ready to turn to our central question: is Deutero-Isaiah employing a real Gattung which is made up of a highly stylized disputational structure set in the context of a trial framework? This question must be answered negatively. First of all, the fact that Deutero-Isaiah uses the same basic disputation style for both trial speeches and disputation speeches suggests that his inclusion of this disputational language in the framework of the trial is arbitrary. Furthermore, we have no evidence outside the preaching of Deutero-Isaiah of disputation speech with questions introduced by מי set in the context of the trial. In fact, I do not believe that Deutero-Isaiah has employed a disputation Gattung known in Israel around which he arbitrarily sets a trial framework. To be sure, questions introduced by מי and sometimes concluded by statements introduced by הן suggest the possibility that Deutero-Isaiah is fusing a Gattung known from Wisdom circles into a trial framework (cf. Jb. 38ff., especially 40:25ff.; Pr. 30:4; Is. 40: 12-17).[92] But disputations containing questions introduced by מי appear in non-Wisdom setting.[93] Moreover, the Deutero-Isaianic speeches do not betray the content of the speeches from the Wisdom disputation Gattung which we examined in the previous chapter. These Wisdom disputations use the secrets of the created order as subject matter, displaying an almost-technical interest in the structure of creation.[94] Moreover, the function of these Wisdom disputations is to contrast man's wisdom with that of God by means of rhetorical questions showing that man does not know the secrets of creation.[95] Even Isaiah 40:12-17 displays this contrast between the wisdom of God and man without a hint of interest in Israel's history of salvation.

---

[91] Cf. 40:18-24, 25-26; 46:5-11.

[92] Cf. my discussion in Chapter II.

[93] 2 Kings 18:35 (Is. 36:20). Perhaps Ex. 4:11 is not drawn from a Wisdom background.

The disputational elements in Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches, however, deal with Cyrus as an event in Israel's salvation history. Although appeal is made to Yahweh as creator, there is no interest in a catalogue of the structure of the created order. Furthermore, there is no attempt to contrast the wisdom of God with that of man. Instead, these disputations try to convince objectors that Yahweh is the God and that his word about Cyrus as a new saving event for Israel can be trusted.

In addition, the disputational elements in Deutero-Isaiah's speeches do not correspond form critically to the Wisdom Gattung. In the latter, the rhetorical questions often introduced by מי appear as a whole series of questions (Jb. 38ff.; Pr. 30:4; Is. 40:12-17). In Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches, however, the series of questions is not to be found, and the question introduced by מי usually appears only once in the speech (41:26; 43:9; 45:21; 48:14). In 41:1ff., the question appears twice (vv. 2, 4), but even here it is not the same kind of question sequence that we find in the Wisdom Gattung. In the latter, the entire series is a piling up of rhetorical questions. In Isaiah 41:1ff., the first question is not rhetorical but rather the disputed matter itself.

---

[94] Note the detail in the description of world order in Jb. 38ff. and Is. 40: 12-17.

[95] Cf. Jb. 38ff.; Pr. 30:4.

The stylization of the disputational language, therefore, seems to have no setting outside the preaching of Deutero-Isaiah. Form and content cannot adequately be paralleled elsewhere. Furthermore, the disputational language incorporates hymnic self-praise style, which belongs originally to the hymn,[96] and there is no evidence for use of self-praise of the deity in disputations outside Deutero-Isaiah.

c. In addition to the disputational elements and the motif held in common with the Mt. Carmel narrative, there are cultic elements in Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations. Even though von Waldow's view of the speech forms is not tenable, we must recognize the influence of the cult. It is worthy of note, for example, that Deutero-Isaiah constantly refers to the Babylonians in general terms like איים (41:1), גוים (43:9; 45:20), and לאומים (41:1; 43:9).

---

[96] Cf. my discussion of self-praise style in Chapter II.

This is due, I believe, to the influence of the cult in which Yahweh is depicted in a court scene with the nations (or their gods), who are designated by such general terms (cf. Ps. 7:8; 9:9; 97:1; 98:9). The form of these Deutero-Isaianic trial speeches is also influenced by the cult. We have already seen how the originally cultic self-praise of the deity has permeated the disputational elements of the trial speeches in Deutero-Isaiah. Another example of cultic influence is the exhortation not to be afraid in 44:8. This has no setting in the trial; instead, it is derived from the cultic salvation oracle.[97] But these cultic elements are not all-embracing categories by means of which we can describe the Gattung of these trial speeches. They are simply one of the areas of life from which Deutero-Isaiah draws his language in the formation of the trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations.

d. I have attempted to demonstrate that Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations or their gods contain elements of form and content from a variety of places. The cultically-preserved court scene between Yahweh and the nations or their gods provides much of the imagery. But the trial scene as preserved in the cult is modified by an old motif (known also in 1 Kings 18) so that Yahweh is no longer sovereign judge, but rather a deity who must prove that he is God. In addition, Yahweh argues his case in a disputational style which cannot be shown to be a part of an Israelite trial Gattung; instead, Deutero-Isaiah has been the prime factor in the stylization of this disputational language. These elements have been artfully combined by our prophet under the rubric of a trial as a means of convincing Israelite doubters that Yahweh's power is believable even in their circumstances of the exile. The structure of the trial speeches is the work of our prophet to meet that situation.

---

[97] Cf. Begrich, "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel," pp. 81-92, and Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 6-18; von Waldow, Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja, pp. 11-28; Westermann, "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," EvTh 24 (1964), pp. 355-373, and Sprache und Struktur, pp. 117-124.

This is not for one moment to suggest that Deutero-Isaiah did not at any point draw upon real trial Gattungen. Boecker has demonstrated convincingly, in my opinion, that Isaiah 44:6-8 is an imitation of a Gattung from trial in the gate. Moreover, the fact that there are different kinds of trial speeches--i.e., summons to the opposing party, summons to witnesses--suggests that Deutero-Isaiah has in mind different trial speech forms. But even in the case of 44:6-8, the fusion of Deutero-Isaiah's imitation of trial in the gate with the imagery of the court scene from the cult[98] and the language of disputation and the salvation oracle (v. 8aα) prevents this speech from being understood as a Gattung--real or imitated--which existed apart from Deutero-Isaiah's preaching. The same is true for the rest of the trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations.

---

[98] Yahweh is described as king.

The conclusion that the form of these speeches is attributable mostly to Deutero-Isaiah himself must not tempt us to abandon form critical methodology. On the contrary, we find that these speeches separate themselves from their context because they are trial speeches throughout. In this connection a certain structure occurs: (1) Yahweh's opponents (or witnesses) are summoned to trial, and (2) Yahweh argues his case in a highly stereotyped disputation style. This structure, though it is without roots in Israel's history, is a Gattung, created de novo by our prophet from various formal elements to meet a particular crisis in the life of Israel.

3. Form in Relation to Context

I have attempted to argue that Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations or their gods exhibit a structure which will allow them to be isolated from their context, but that this structure has its Sitz im Leben in Deutero-Isaiah's preaching. This can be seen even more clearly as each speech is examined separately. But if we are dealing with a speech-form whose structure is attributable to Deutero-Isaiah himself, can we suppose that it was originally an isolated unit of speech? Is it not possible that it is a part of a larger poetic composition? Only an examination of each speech in terms of both form and context can answer such questions, and it is to that task that we now address ourselves.

a. 43:8-13; 41:21-29; 43:1-7. (1) 43:8-13 follows the Deutero-Isaianic structure outlined above. Witnesses are summoned to trial (vv. 8-9aα). Then Yahweh presents his case in the typical Deutero-Isaianic disputation style. Beginning with a question introduced by מי , Yahweh sets forth the conditions by means of which the dispute is to be settled: "Who among them can declare this, and can tell us the former things?" Yahweh then utters a challenge for the gods to bring forth witnesses to verify their ability to declare the ראשנות (v. 9b). Yahweh continues by informing Israel that they are his witnesses (v. 10). The prophet's technique of using a trial scene as a vehicle for disputing with doubting Israel has touched on a point of agreement. Any Israelite would know from his religious heritage that Yahweh uttered the "former things" and that they came to pass. Thus the prophet can have Yahweh employ Israel as witnesses to this fact without any objection from his hearers. The trial moves on, and it is apparent that there are no witnesses for the gods. Now the way is open for the resolution of the dispute, and the prophet can have Yahweh claim that he alone is God and Savior without any further objection (vv. 11-13). This resolution of the dispute takes place in the self-praise style typical of Deutero-Isaiah's disputations.

This speech sets itself off from the context because it is a trial speech throughout. In these verses, Yahweh summons witnesses, and the disputational language is the presentation of Yahweh's case at the trial. The surrounding context, by contrast, does not reflect a trial scene. Vv. 1-7 and vv. 14ff., viewed form critically, are salvation oracles.[99]

(2) In 41:21-29, the typical Deutero-Isaianic structure of summons to trial and argument in disputation style can be observed. A question introduced by מי is found in v. 26, and the claim of Yahweh over against his opponents in dispute is twice introduced by הן (vv. 24, 29).[100] The dispute is settled in typical Deutero-Isaianic fashion by attention to the question, "Who declared from the beginning....?" (v. 26).[101] Nevertheless, a more complete picture of the trial is given in this speech than in other Deutero-Isaianic trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations or their gods. In fact, we are confronted with what appears to be almost a step-by-step picture of Yahweh's words as the trial proceeds. After the gods are summoned to trial, Yahweh challenges them to demonstrate that they are gods (vv. 21-23). Then he states his own claim (v. 24).[102] Next follows Yahweh's own case, in which the typical Deutero-Isaianic disputational style is woven into the imagery of the trial. It

---

[99] Cf. Chapter IV.

[100] Cf. 40:15; 50:1, 2.

[101] Cf. vv. 22-23.

[102] Read מאפס.

begins with the assertion, which is under dispute, that Yahweh is responsible for arousing Cyrus (v. 25).[103] In order to convince doubters of the validity of this claim, Deutero-Isaiah has Yahweh ask the rhetorical question, "Who declared from the beginning...?" (v. 26). Then Yahweh, addressing the gods, asserts that they did not speak such powerful words and that they can produce no one who heard their words (v. 26b). Yahweh, by contrast, declared the ראשנות to Zion (v. 27),[104] as every Israelite knows. Deutero-Isaiah, having elicited the agreement of his hearers that Yahweh declared the "former things," proceeds from this base of agreement. Yahweh looks to the gods for evidence of their ability to speak so powerfully and finds no god able to produce such evidence (v. 28). The argument is now secure, and Yahweh can utter his final assertion about the gods without further objection:

> Behold (הן), all of them are idols;
> Their deeds are nothing; their molten images are empty wind.

41:21-29 can be isolated from its context because it is a trial speech from beginning to end. The preceding verses, analyzed form critically, are of the Gattung called "salvation oracle."[105] 42:1ff. does not reflect the trial Gattung either. Instead, it is a speech of Yahweh concerning his Servant.

---

[103] ויבס is probable in v. 25b, although the LXX and 1QIsa reflect the verb בוא . The emendation is probable because of parallelism.

[104] The text is untranslatable as it stands. Read *hinnē higgadtī*, as parallelism suggests.

(3) In 41:1-7 we can see the usual Deutero-Isaianic structure. The summons to trial appears in v. 1. The argument of Yahweh's case is in Deutero-Isaiah's typical question style. Beginning with the disputed matter itself contained in a question introduced by מי (vv. 2-3), then Yahweh appeals to common knowledge (v. 4a). Yahweh then proceeds to resolve the dispute in self-praise style (v. 4b).

But a new and troublesome element appears in vv. 5-7. These verses seem to be a description of the nations' reaction to Yahweh's summons and argument in vv. 1-4. Nowhere else in Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches does this appear. The transfer of vv. 6-7 behind 40:19 is arbitrary,[106] as well as the assumption that v. 5 is secondary.[107] Moreover, it is unlikely that we should repoint the verbs in v. 5 as imperatives and jussives.[108] While this is possible, there is no solid textual support for so doing.[109] Besides, even if we did, the problem of vv. 6-7 would not be eliminated. It is better, I think, to work with the text as we have it.

---

[105] Cf. Chapter IV.

[106] B. Duhm, Das Buch Jesaia uebersetzt und erklaert, 4th. ed., HKAT, 3/1 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1922), p. 303; Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 46.

[107] Duhm, op. cit., p. 303.

[108] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 29.

Vv. 5-7 need not be a stumbling block if we take into account the prophet's freedom as a literary creator. We have already seen that the basic structure, which is the prophet's own creation, is present. In addition, we saw in Chapter II the tendency of the prophet to use sarcastic descriptions of idol-making in his disputation speeches when he wants to contrast the idols with the power of Yahweh.[110] Here we have an example of the same kind of thing, but in these verses, fitted to the situation of the trial. The nations hear Yahweh's summons. They "draw near and come," but in fear, because of the contrast between their gods, who are created, with Yahweh, who creates and summons the generations.

Again, Deutero-Isaiah utilizes his schematic combination of disputational and trial language in a rather free manner. Even so, vv. 1-7 can be distinguished from their context because of the trial setting. Vv. 8ff. display the form of the salvation oracle.[111] 40:27-31 is a part of a long disputational context,[112] and speaking form critically, these verses are a disputation rather than a trial. Moreover, the shift from prophetic speech in 40:27-31 to the first person of Yahweh in 41:1ff. indicates that the latter does not belong form critically to the preceding context.

---

[109] 1QIsa would allow, although not demand, this possibility. The LXX, however, reads the verbs as perfects.

[110] 40:18-24; 46:5-11.

[111] Cf. Chapter IV.

[112] Cf. my analysis in Chapter II.

(4) We have seen that each of these three speeches stands out from its context by the criteria of form. They cannot be connected to the context as a part of a larger formal unit. Muilenburg tries to do this by seeing all of 41:1-42:4 under the rubric of the trial.[113] But 41:8-13, 14-16, 17-20 and 42:1-4 belong to Gattungen at home in settings other than the trial. Therefore, the ability to see the entire chapter from the point of view of the trial is a framework supplied by Muilenburg's imagination rather than by links made explicitly in the text.

b. 44:6-8. The typical Deutero-Isaianic structure is present here, although the sequence of the elements is unique. Yahweh begins with the claim that he alone is God, stated in self-praise hymnic style (v. 6). The matter under dispute appears in the form of a question introduced by מי, "Who is like me?" (v. 7). Then the summons to trial follows, in which Yahweh challenges his opponents to present their case by declaring what is to come (v. 7). It is probable that the style of a question introduced by מי is used here also.[114] Our prophet has Yahweh appeal to common Israelite knowledge of his ability to declare the future as they have experienced this power in the past, and it is to this experience of the effectiveness of Yahweh's word that the appeal is made as they are summoned as witnesses (v. 8). Proceeding from this base of general agreement, the prophet then has Yahweh move to resolve the argument. Yahweh asks a question, which in this context is rhetorical, in the self-praise style characteristic of Deutero-Isaiah, "Is there a God besides me?" To this question is attached a statement that there is no such deity.

---

[113] Muilenburg, op. cit., pp. 447ff.

We have discussed already the elements recoverable to form critical analysis.[115] It is an imitation of a legal situation in which witnesses are called to validate a claim. But this imitation of speech from trial in the gate provides only the general background. Language which does not belong to trial in the gate is a major element of the speech. The typical Deutero-Isaianic disputation style, which is unrelated to forms from trial in the gate, forms the core of Yahweh's argument. Moreover, v. 8aα , a word of comfort resembling the language of the salvation oracle,[116] introduces a cultic element into this trial speech. We can find no other *Sitz im Leben* for the combination of these elements besides the preaching of Deutero-Isaiah.

---

[114] Read מי השמיע מעולם אתיות . The LXX, however, presupposes a text similar to MT, and 1QIsa has, "Not since I established an eternal people have they (literally, 'he') spoken the future, declared what will come." Nevertheless, analogy from other trial speeches in Deutero-Isaiah and poetic parallelism suggest the emendation.

[115] Cf. my discussion of this text above in the analysis of previous scholarship on Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches.

This speech can be set off from its context, however, because the entire speech reflects the setting of the trial. The previous verses, viewed form critically, are in the form of a salvation oracle,[117] and thus not connected with the institution of the trial. Moreover, the content of vv. 1-5 is not related to the trial involving Yahweh and the gods. But how shall vv. 6-8 be viewed in relationship to vv. 9-20? Are vv. 9-20 to be seen in analogy with 41:5-7[118] as a sarcastic description of idol-making related closely to Yahweh's argument presented at the trial? Or is the connection secondary?

The most important thing is to find a way of deciding. We cannot really apply form critical criteria. Deutero-Isaiah, as we have seen, is a free agent with regard to forms. To be sure, he employs traditional *Gattungen*, and his own way of combining them is stereotyped to such an extent that they almost have the appearance of a real *Gattung*. But they are not a *Gattung* whose form has been shaped by long usage in the oral patterns of Israel, so there is nothing to prevent Deutero-Isaiah from altering his usual structure in a given speech. Therefore, form critical criteria cannot tell us whether vv. 9-20 are a part of the basic speech-unit.

---

[116] In v. 8 1QIsa reads ואל תיראו, which is probably the correct text. Nevertheless, note the uncertainty in the textual transmission reflected in the various witnesses of the text in Greek.

[117] Cf. Chapter IV.

[118] 40:19-20 and 46:6-7--both disputations which are not set in the framework of the trial--may also be compared along with 41:5-7.

Nevertheless, the fact that Deutero-Isaiah's speeches are rather stereotyped suggests that we may find clues to the solution of the problem by comparison with Deutero-Isaianic style elsewhere. For this reason, a comparison of the function of 44:9-20 in relation to vv. 6-8 with the other instances of sarcastic description of idol-making in relation to their context is a good place to begin. In 46: 5-11, the inanimate idols cannot be compared to Yahweh because they are made by men. This is in contrast to Yahweh the creator, who instead of being created utters event-creating words. Moreover, the idol who does not speak (46:7) is contrasted with Yahweh, who speaks creative words. In 41:1-7, the description of idol-making is directly related to the nations' "fearing" and "trembling" as they come to the trial. In 40:18-24, the idols made by men are the opposite of the Creator who deposes "princes and judges." In a word, in these three instances the description of idol-making can be shown to play an integral role in the speech.

A close examination of 44:9-20, however, reveals that the description of idol-making is not closely related to vv. 6-8. In vv. 6-8, the trial speech is a response to the people's doubt that Yahweh is the Lord of the world. Presumably the doubt may be related to the emergence of Cyrus. The purpose of the trial is to demonstrate that Yahweh is God and Yahweh alone because only he can declare the future. In vv. 9-20, however, not a word is said about the power to declare the future. Instead, the idols are viewed negatively because they "do not profit" (v. 9). The thrust of vv. 9-20 is to heap scorn on the competence and understanding of the idol-*worshippers* rather than to deal with their deities' power to declare the future.[119] Even though the emphasis shifts to the idols themselves in v. 18, attention swiftly returns to those who make and worship them.

Another indication of the secondary connection of vv. 9-20 with vv. 6-8 is the looseness of the catchword connections. The עדים in vv. 6-8 testify to Yahweh's ability to declare the future. In vv. 9-20, by contrast, there is no emphasis on the legal function of the עדים (v. 9). In the case of the catchword פחד, it appears in vv. 6-8 as a word of comfort for doubting Israel because she knows from her past history that Yahweh's word is trustworthy. In vv. 9-20, it is used in connection with a summons to assemble for "dread and shame" (v. 11). The summons to assemble in vv. 9-20 (v. 11) is probably drawn out of a trial background, but the subject matter of the trial differs from that of vv. 6-8. In vv. 6-8, Yahweh and the nations (or the gods) are opponents in the trial for the purpose of determining which deity is God; the summons in v. 11 calls the idol-worshippers to assemble for "dread and shame." These catchword connections are so loose that it is unlikely that the speech is a unity.

---

[119] Note that the subject of the sentences is for the most part the idol-worshippers.

c. 48:12-15. The typical Deutero-Isaianic structure of summons to trial and argument by means of a question introduced by מי (v. 14) can be seen. As is often the case, Yahweh makes assertions in self-praise style (vv. 12-13). Looking more carefully, we can see that the structure of this speech is similar to 45:18-21. After the introductory call to attention, Yahweh makes the claim that he is God, the first and the last and the creator.[120] Then Yahweh summons his opponents to trial (v. 14aα).[121] The shift from singular to plural address probably indicates that Yahweh has turned his attention from Israel to the nations.[122] This indicates that this speech is a trial speech instead of a disputation speech, for the nations are never addressed in Deutero-Isaiah's disputation speeches. Yahweh argues his case by appealing to what is already known, "Who among them created these?"[123] Obviously an Israelite would answer on the basis of what he knows by tradition that none of the gods created the earth, but Yahweh instead. The proper groundwork having been laid,

---

[120] 45:18-21 begins with a claim made in self-praise style (vv. 18-19).

[121] Cf. 45:20.

[122] Cf. above, footnote 88.

[123] Cf. 45:21.

Yahweh moves to resolve the case:

> Yahweh loves him; he will perform his will on Babylon, his
> might (literally 'his arm')[124] on the Chaldeans.
> I, I have spoken, yea, I have called him. It has brought
> him; his way will prosper.[125]

In a word, Yahweh argues that since his prophetic word has been reliable in the past, his hearers may now believe what he has now spoken about Cyrus.

V. 14b is difficult if one compares this speech with the structure of the rest of the Deutero-Isaianic speeches between Yahweh and the nations or their gods. Normally, the first person of Yahweh dominates throughout the speech. A glance into the history of the textual transmission of v. 14b shows the difficulty of establishing the text. The LXX would be rendered into Hebrew as follows: אֹהַבְךָ עָשִׂיתִי חֶפְצְךָ בְּבָבֶל וְזֶרַע כַּשְׂדִּים[126] But 1QIsa reads,[127] "Yahweh loves me; he will perform[128] his will on Babylon, his might[129] on the Chaldeans." The problem is too complex to arrive at a complete reconstruction of the original text, but it can be shown, I believe, that the Massoretic text is in general the correct text. חפץ in Deutero-Isaiah, when it can be translated by "purpose," refers to Yahweh's purpose.[130] In fact, it has to do with his purpose in connection with Cyrus. Thus it is likely that the suffix on the noun in this verse refers to Yahweh, thus ruling out the second person suffix of the LXX. Since the textual traditions reading חפץ as belonging to Yahweh use a third person pronominal suffix,[131] it would be sheer speculation to hypothesize that v. 14b was originally cast in the first person of Yahweh, as the LXX reads, but with first person suffix חפצי. We can only assume that the third person character of v. 14b is probably original.[132]

---

[124] Or, "The Chaldeans will be dispersed," reading זֹרְעוּ. Cf. G.R. Driver, "Notes on Isaiah," BZAW 77 (1958), pp. 47-48.

[125] For this use of the Hiph'il of צלח, cf. e.g., Is. 55:11; Ps. 1:3.

[126] Some witnesses, notably Lucian, are much nearer MT. Cf. Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum graecum, Ed., Sociatatis Litterarum Gottingensis, Vol. XIV (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1939), p. 303.

[127] יהוה אוהבי וישה חפצו בבבל זרועו כשדיים.

[128] ויעשה is probably intended.

Now that the third person in v. 14b seems to be correct, how are we to understand it in the light of the Deutero-Isaianic structure? Since a comparison with the trial and disputation speeches elsewhere in Deutero-Isaiah offers no parallel, it seems best to begin by asking how v. 14b functions in this passage. The purpose of vv. 12-15 is to argue that Yahweh's word has creative power--and is thus dependable--in contrast to that of the gods. Since Israel has experienced the power of his word in the past, they can now believe that the word he has uttered about Cyrus[133] will come to pass in the future.[134] V. 14b might be something like a quotation of a previously-uttered word concerning Cyrus. It has the ring of a royal oracle spoken in the third person: "Yahweh loves him; he will perform his will on Babylon...." Certainly the freedom of Deutero-Isaiah to fuse and modify Gattungen would allow for such a modification of his usual structure in these speeches. But even if this line is not to be understood as a fragment of a royal oracle quoted in this trial speech, alternation between first and third person of Yahweh occurs elsewhere in prophetic literature.

---

[129] Cf. footnote 124.

[130] Is. 44:28; 46:10; 48:14.

[131] MT, 1QIsa. Cf. Septuaginta, Vol. XIV, p. 303, for Greek texts supporting the third person suffix.

[132] Unless, of course, the verse is a gloss. We have no evidence, however, that such is the case.

48:12-15 stands out from its context as a trial speech throughout. Another indication of its formal independence is the similarity of its structure to that of 45:18-21. But the fact that it is independent of context on the basis of form does not mean necessarily that it was uttered separately from its context, so it is to the question of context that we now turn. The secondary connections with vv. 1-11 have already been discussed.[135] But what are the connections with v. 16?

---

[133] "I, I have spoken; yea, I have called him; I have brought him."

[134] "His way will prosper."

[135] Cf. my discussion in Chapter II.

Let us first note formal features. V. 16 opens with a new address and is a speech in the mouth of Yahweh (v. 16a), closing with a word of the prophet (v. 16b). This formal pattern occurs also in Zechariah 2:13, 15; 4:9; 6:15,[136] where it is clear that it functions as an authentication of the prophet's mission. This is also the case in Isaiah 48:16. The prophet's hearers can believe that now (ועתה) the prophet is sent by Yahweh because they know that from the beginning Yahweh "has not spoken in secret." V. 16, therefore, both by form and content, stands out from the context.

We must now determine whether the connections between vv. 12-15 and v. 16 are original or secondary. Since they are not connected by formal criteria, we must decide whether they form a kerygmatic unit. In this regard, there is some connection in subject matter. Both formal units deal with the believability of the present word of Yahweh in light of the reliability of that word in the past. Moreover, שמע and דבר appear to be catchword connections. But we must not overlook significant differences. In vv. 12-15, the central concern is to convince Israel by means of the reliability of Yahweh's word in the past that Yahweh is powerful enough to call Cyrus. In fact there is a word play on קרא (vv. 13, 15). V. 16, on the contrary, is concerned only with the defense of the prophet. These differences suggest the likelihood that vv. 12-15 and v. 16

---

[136] I owe this insight to W. Zimmerli, op. cit., p. 37.

were not originally uttered together.

d. 45:18-21. I have already suggested that 45:18-21 is similar in structure to 48:12-15. Both Begrich and von Waldow, however, view the unit as extending from v. 18 through v. 25. In Begrich's discussion of the passage,[137] which he assigns to the category of disputation speech, vv. 18-20 serve as the common base of agreement upon which he builds the argument. There appears a summons to come together in order to discuss the matter. In v. 21 we find the subject of dispute: "Who has declared this from the beginning?" The conclusion is left for the hearers to draw for themselves. Although Begrich considers vv. 22-25 as a part of the unit, he does not discuss their structure.

Von Waldow's discussion of the entire passage is more complete. Since he too views this passage as a disputation speech, his categories of disputation basis (the common base of agreement) and conclusion are prominent.[138] Vv. 18-19 are the disputation basis.[139] The conclusion consists of a summons to come together (v. 20) and invitation to the opponents to contradict what was said in the disputation basis (v. 21). Since the opponents cannot successfully contradict Yahweh's claim, they must accept that claim and act on the basis of its truth. This means that they should turn to Yahweh and be saved (vv. 22-25). This part of the conclusion, based on the common base of agreement in vv. 18-19 which in turn leads to the conclusion that Yahweh alone is God (v. 21), is expressed in the form of an exhortation.

---

[137] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 43-44. Cf. also p. 42.

[138] Cf. my discussion of von Waldow in Chapter II.

[139] The disputation basis begins with the statement, "I am Yahweh, and there is no other." Cf. von Waldow, Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja, pp. 30, 196 (footnote 12).

First of all, it is necessary to correct the understanding of Begrich and von Waldow that this passage is a disputation speech. To be sure, the style of disputation appears. But the summons in v. 21 is parallel to the summons to trial seen elsewhere in Deutero-Isaiah.[140] Therefore, it is more accurate to classify it, along with the similar 48:12-15, under the category of trial speech.

In the next place, the inclusion of vv. 22-25 with vv. 18-21 as a single speech unit identifiable under the heading of one Gattung is open to question. Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations function as arguments that Yahweh, not the foreign gods, is God. Deutero-Isaiah has developed a structure for this purpose which includes summons to trial and a disputation for Yahweh's supremacy. This disputation makes use of questions introduced by מי and assertions in first person self-praise style. This stereotyped structure of Deutero-Isaiah's is present in vv. 18-21. Yahweh's speech begins with an assertion in self-praise style (vv. 18-19), the truth of which would be agreed upon by Israelites because of their knowledge of Yahweh from their tradition. Then Deutero-Isaiah has Yahweh summon nations to trial (v. 21). They are challenged to present their case by demonstrating that their gods have the power of the prophetic word. The conditions for determining deity and thus settling the case before the court appear in the form of a question introduced by מי . Since Israelites can agree with Yahweh in vv. 18-19 that Yahweh has uttered creative words in the past, Deutero-Isaiah has Yahweh move to resolve the argument. The nations apparently cannot make the same claim, so the argument is secure, and Yahweh can claim that he alone is God without further objection. This he does by means of a rhetorical question in self-praise style (v. 21). Deutero-Isaiah's stereotyped structure for the trial ends with v. 21. 45:22-25 represent another genre of speech. The imperatives in v. 22 begin an exhortation, a type of speech known elsewhere in prophetic literature.[141] This is not to say that vv. 18-21 and vv. 22-25 could not have been uttered together originally. I am simply concerned to show that vv. 22-25 have not only departed from the usual form of Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations, but that they display another speech form, which cannot simply be included in the trial by form critical criteria. If vv. 18-21 and vv. 22-25 were originally uttered together, it cannot be demonstrated on the basis of form.

---

[140] Cf. e.g., 41:21; 43:8. Cf. Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, p. 136.

---

[141] Cf. Gunkel's introduction to H. Schmidt's *Die grossen Propheten*, *SAT* 2/2 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1915), pp. lxvi-lxvii.

Nevertheless, I do want to argue that they were uttered together, forming an irreducible message unit. There are certain common features between vv. 18-21 and vv. 22-25. In both, the nations are addressed (vv. 20, 22). Both deal with the reliability of Yahweh's word (vv. 18-19, 21, 23). Both are concerned with the object of the nations' worship. Even the catchwords ישע (vv. 20, 21, 22), צדק (vv. 19, 21, 24, 25), and זרע יעקב/ישראל (vv. 19, 25) are striking. But is there a continuity between them of such a nature that would allow us to speak of a kerygmatic unit? A positive answer is justified, in my opinion. Yahweh invites the nations to turn and be saved by him, since he is the only God. Moreover, he has uttered an oath--an irrevocable word--that "every knee shall bow" to him. All who oppose him will be "put to shame." In the situation of the exile, such claims by Yahweh were open to radical doubt. Vv. 18-21 precede this exhortation in order to demonstrate that there is no basis to doubt Yahweh's oath, for he has shown himself in the past to be a God whose word is trustworthy, in contrast to the impotent gods of the nations. In order to buttress his exhortation to the nations, Deutero-Isaiah uses a speech-form used by him elsewhere--the trial to determine who is God. The trial in vv. 18-21 differs from his other trial speeches between Yahweh and the nations in that Cyrus is not mentioned, nor is there a hint that the real purpose of the speech is to convince doubting Israel that Cyrus was aroused by Yahweh rather than by the foreign gods. Instead, vv. 18-21 are intended to prove that the nations' deities are nothing, preparing the way for the exhortation to the nations to turn and be saved by Yahweh, who alone is God.[142] By content and vocabulary, vv. 18-21 fit so closely with the address to the nations in vv. 22-25 that it appears likely that they form a kerygmatic whole.

Now we must decide whether vv. 14-17 and vv. 18-25 are connected originally or secondarily. There are certain connections. The catchwords סתר (vv. 15, 19) and בוש (vv. 17, 24) appear in both. In both, the nations are the subject of concern. Idol worshippers are mentioned in both (vv. 16, 20), as well as the fact that the idols are made by men (vv. 16, 20). In both the idol-worshippers or those "incensed at Yahweh" will be "put to shame" in contrast to Israel, who is saved by her God (vv. 16-17, 24-25). Both represent the nations in confession that Yahweh alone is God (vv. 14-15, 24). Finally, it must not be overlooked that the two passages are connected by כי . But there are also discontinuities. In vv. 14-17 Israel is addressed, while the nations are addressed in vv. 18-25 (explicitly in vv. 22-25). The messenger formula beginning each passage (vv. 14, 18) suggests a separate formal unit, although this in itself is not decisive when we are asking concerning kerygmatic units. Vv. 14-17 differ also from vv. 18-25 in that there is no concern for the reliability of Yahweh's word. Vv. 14-17 emphasize the wealth of the nations coming to Zion and those nations making a pilgrimage to Zion in chains, bowing down before her. This is part of a particular tradition in Israel of the pilgrimage of the nations to Zion,[143] which in Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah depict the nations as servants of Zion and her children.[144] The latter part of vv. 18-25--vv. 22-25-- is drawn from the same tradition, but in modified form. The normal usage of the tradition in Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah, and reflected in vv. 14-17, emphasizes that the pilgrimage of the nations is primarily for Zion's good fortune. Their wealth is to belong to Zion (45:14; 60:5-7, 11); they are to bow down before Zion (45:14; 49:23; 60:14). In general, the nations will be servants, coming in chains (45:14), carrying Zion's children home (49:22), and performing services for Zion (49:23; 60:10). Vv. 22-25 retain the idea of the pilgrimage and the nations' confession before Yahweh, but the emphasis is on the salvation of the nations and the role of Yahweh's irrevocable word in this salvation process. Therefore, although certainty is not to be had, these differences suggest the likelihood that vv. 14-17 and vv. 18-25 were originally unconnected, having been joined later by כי because of similar theme and catchword connections.[145] Nevertheless, the collector's use of כי indicates that he intended to make a kerygmatic connection, however loose it may be. Thus we must suppose that the collector wanted to express continuity, even though the connections were so loose that we are unable to discover continuity in thought between them.

---

[142] The address to the nations is of course a literary device of the prophet. We do not need to suppose that the nations were actually addressed. The basis of agreement from which the disputation proceeds (vv. 18-19)--the content of Yahweh's case in the trial--would be a common base for Israelites only.

---

[143] Cf. von Rad, op. cit., pp. 294ff.

[144] 45:14-17; 49:22-23; 60:1ff.

C. SUMMARY

I have attempted to show that all of Deutero-Isaiah's trial speeches--the trial between Yahweh and Israel and the trial between Yahweh and the nations--are in large measure shaped by the prophet's own hand. To be sure, in some of them we can see the clear imitation of Gattungen known in Israel (44:6-8; 43:22-28). In others, the form of the speech is shaped less by traditional Gattungen and more by Deutero-Isaiah himself. But in all of them we have seen that the prophet's own hand has played a large role in shaping the form of the speech.

Although the trial between Yahweh and the nations and the trial between Yahweh and Israel can be separated from one another form critically, primarily because of the stereotyped structure of the former throughout Deutero-Isaiah, there are certain connecting features. It is noteworthy that in every instance Deutero-Isaiah employs the trial speeches for disputational purposes. In the case of the trial between Yahweh and the nations, the purpose is to convince doubters that Yahweh is God. In the trial between Yahweh and Israel other matters are normally the issue. In 50:1-3, the claim of Israelites that Yahweh has forsaken them and that he is powerless to save is disputed. 43:22-28 disputes Israel's plea for help on the basis that they are righteous. The fact that all of these trial speeches really function as disputations is no accident, for Deutero-Isaiah transformed trial forms in order to argue with doubters. Since the purpose of trial speeches in Gattungen belonging to Israel's institutions is to deal with violations of the established order rather than to dispute assertions, it seems clear that Deutero-Isaiah has used the trial as a literary device for the purpose of disputation, and in so doing has divorced the trial from its moorings in traditional Gattungen. To be sure, he has followed the example of his prophetic predecessors in using the trial to counter an accusation made by Israelites (cf. Je. 2:5ff., for example), but Deutero-Isaiah has gone far beyond his predecessors. Particularly in the trial between Yahweh and the nations, in which the structure is almost entirely Deutero-Isaianic, Deutero-Isaiah has struck out in a new direction in his employment of the trial.

---

[145] The suggestion of Duhm (op. cit., p. 347) that v. 19 is a correction of the nations' belief that Yahweh is a hidden God (v. 15) is a misinterpretation of v. 19. That verse does not correct the nations' confession in v. 15. Instead, Yahweh's assertion in v. 19 that he did not speak "in secret" is a claim to counter the objection that Yahweh's present word is not reliable. Thus סתר in v. 15 and v. 19 is only an external catchword connection.

Both kinds of trial speeches in Deutero-Isaiah are bound together also by their reference to the same historical situation. In each case, the trial is used by Deutero-Isaiah to counter a false view which is characteristic particularly of the situation of the exile--doubt of Yahweh's power, the belief that Yahweh has forsaken his obligations to Israel, and Israel's belief that they are righteous.

IV. SALVATION SPEECHES AND RELATED FORMS

No one denies that Deutero-Isaiah announced salvation. But as in the cases with the kinds of speech analyzed in previous chapters, there is considerable difference of opinion concerning the literary character of this type of speech. Can we discover a Gattung (or Gattungen) which can be isolated from the context by form and whose Sitz im Leben can be identified? And if we can, is the Gattung used in its original setting, or have we a prophetic imitation of a Gattung at home in another realm of life? In addition, we must ask whether these forms can be isolated from their context as originally separate units of tradition or whether they are parts of a longer poetic composition. Finally, we must remain open to the possibility that no Gattung can be found, or at least that our prophet employs only snippets of a salvation speech Gattung with the result that formal criteria are not determinative in the formation of the passages in which Deutero-Isaiah announces salvation.

A. CRITIQUE OF PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP

The work of Begrich has set the tone for the continuing conversation concerning the form of Deutero-Isaiah's salvation speeches. In 1934 he produced an epoch-making article in which he attempted to demonstrate that eight texts in Deutero-Isaiah, as well as two passages in Jeremiah, are prophetic imitations of the oracle uttered by a priest in the cult in response to an individual lament psalm.[1] A priest uttered this oracle, in Begrich's opinion, following the complaint and petition sections of the lament psalm, preceding the certainty of hearing.[2]

Always a word of Yahweh to an individual, the form is as follows: (1) "Fear not,"[3] (2) direct address,[4] (3) substantiating clause indicating the nearness of Yahweh's help, usually in the form of a nominal sentence,[5] (4) expression that Yahweh has heard, presented in the perfect tense with Yahweh as grammatical subject,[6] and (5) announcement of the future, usually in the imperfect. Yahweh is often the grammatical subject,[7] but other subjects sometimes occur.[8]

---

[1] Begrich, "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel," ZAW 52 (1934), pp. 81-92. The texts are: Is. 41:8-13, 14-16; 43:1-3a, 5; (44:2-5); 48:17-19; 49:7, 14-15; 51:7-8; 54:4-8; Je. 30:10=46:27; 30:11=46:28.

[2] Begrich, "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel," p. 81.

[3] Is. 41:10, 13, 14; 43:1, 5; 44:2; 51:7; 54:4; Je. 30:10=46:27; 30:11=46:28.

[4] Is. 41:8, 14; 44:2; Je. 30:10=46:27; 30:11=46:28.

[5] Cf. e.g., Is. 41:10; Je. 30:10=46:27.

[6] Is. 41:10, 14; 43:1.

[7] Cf. e.g., 43:5, 6; 44:3.

[8] Cf. e.g., 41:11-12; 43:2.

The structure of this salvation oracle corresponds to various parts of the individual complaint psalm. The relationship of "Fear not!" to the lament psalm can be seen in Lamentations 3:57. The substantiating clause corresponds to the expression of confidence. The expression that Yahweh has heard corresponds to the certainty of hearing in the lament psalm. The announcement of the future reflects the language of the petition.[9] The fact that the speeches in Deutero-Isaiah are imitations of the Gattung instead of actual cultic texts can be seen in their use to address the whole people rather than a single individual.[10] Another sign that it is an imitation is that the Gattung is applied to the situation of the exile.

A later study by Begrich,[11] which builds on the 1934 article, adds a series of texts not included in the original study,[12] five of which Begrich regards as imitations of the answer to the communal lament psalm.[13] In these additional texts, while Yahweh speaks in the first person[14] and usually speaks to the supplicant(s) in the second person,[15] there are formal differences with the structure outlined in the 1934 article: (1) "Fear not!" is missing; (2) the direct address is often missing; (3) the substantiating clause in nominal sentence form is usually missing.[16]

---

[9] For further details of the correspondences, see Begrich, "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel," pp. 82-85, 87ff.

[10] Begrich, "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel," p. 81.

[11] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, BWANT, 4 Folge, Heft 25 (77) (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), pp. 6-18.

[12] 41:17-20; 42:14-17; 43:16-21; 45:1-7, 14-17; 46:3-4, 12-13; 49:22-23, 24-26; 51:12-16; 54:11-12+13b, 14a+13a-17; 55:8-13. Cf. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 6.

[13] 41:17-20; 42:14-17; 43:16-21; 51:6-8; 55:8-13. Cf. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 6.

In spite of these formal differences, Begrich believes that both the texts discussed in the 1934 article and those added in Studien zu Deuterojesaja reflect the same Gattung. By both content and form we can see the cultic salvation oracle as the Gattung which is imitated. In his view the structure of the texts discussed in Studien zu Deuterojesaja is similar to that of the texts discussed in 1934. He posits the following form for all texts: (a) announcement of Yahweh's intervention, with Yahweh as grammatical subject and often expressed in the perfect tense,[17] (b) the consequences of Yahweh's intervention, expressed in the imperfect,[18] and (c) the purpose of Yahweh's intervention.[19]

---

[14] Begrich believes that Yahweh is probably the speaker in 45:4-17. Cf. Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 7.

[15] 41:17-20 and 42:14-17 are exceptions.

[16] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 7. Cf. pp. 7ff. for a discussion of the formal and content correspondences with the lament psalm.

[17] 44:21; 45:4; 46:13; 49:6c, 8, 16; 51:22; 54:8, 9, 16; 55:4, 11. Cf. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 8. Sometimes, however, Yahweh's intervention is expressed in the imperfect (41:17-20; 43:16-21; 49:22-23, 24-26). Begrich's member a in Studien zu Deuterojesaja corresponds to the expression that Yahweh has heard as Begrich discussed it in the 1934 journal article. Cf. my discussion above.

The fact that these speeches are imitations is seen by the specific Deutero-Isaianic expectation of the turning of Israel's need in the exile, by the modification of the form by a direct reference to (or quotation of) the complaint.[20] Another indication of imitation appears in 43:16-21, in which "Fear not!" becomes "Do not remember the ראשנות ...." (43:18). This modification arises out of the prophet's experiences of controversy with his hearers.[21] In 55:8-13 imitation can be seen, according to Begrich, in the transformation of the pure oracle form with the style of disputation.[22]

Von Waldow differs from Begrich in that he sees Deutero-Isaiah's salvation oracles, not as imitations of a priestly Gattung, but rather as speeches actually spoken by the prophet Deutero-Isaiah in the cult.

---

[18] This corresponds to the announcement of the future in the 1934 article.

[19] For Begrich's delineation of this structure cf. Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 8.

[20] 54:7, 8; 42:14; (41:17). In particular, cf. 49:14, 24. Cf. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 9-10, 13.

[21] Cf. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 13. The introduction to 51:6 reflects a disputational modification. Cf. Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 14.

[22] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 14. Cf. pp. 14ff. for other modifications which suggest to Begrich that Deutero-Isaiah's speeches are imitations.

For von Waldow, the salvation oracle is a prophetic Gattung.[23] The priest uses only technical means for obtaining revelation, while the prophet is grasped by Yahweh's spirit.[24] The messenger formula, which often introduces the salvation oracle, indicates that the oracle was spoken by a prophet.[25] Moreover, von Waldow points to the concreteness of detail in the promises. Begrich had seen this detail as prophetic imitative expansion of the more general priestly statements such as, "I am with you." But von Waldow views it as evidence that the Gattung is native to the prophetic institution. Most important of all, von Waldow argues that Deutero-Isaiah's salvation oracles have a regularity of form which can be explained only if they are viewed as speeches uttered in their original Sitz im Leben. If they were imitations, the form would become blurred.[26]

The form, according to von Waldow, is as follows:[27]

---

[23] von Waldow, Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rheinischen Friedrich Wilhelms-Universitaet at Bonn, 1953), pp. 83ff. 2 Chr. 20 is a good example of a lament psalm answered by a salvation oracle, and the speaker of the oracle is a prophet.

[24] Cf. 2 Chr. 20:14.

[25] Cf. 2 Chr. 20:15.

[26] von Waldow, op. cit., p. 26.

[27] Ibid., pp. 12ff.

Introduction, including an introductory formula--either messenger formula[28] or call to attention[29] followed by "Fear not!"[30] and direct address;

A: statement of Yahweh's intervention, beginning with a clause with general content,[31] usually with Yahweh as subject,[32] followed by the elaboration of Yahweh's intervention with Yahweh as grammatical subject in either the perfect or imperfect[33] and the substantiation of the intervention (often not present);[34]

B: statement of the consequences of Yahweh's intervention, a statement in which Yahweh is no longer the subject; the statement is always in the imperfect;[35]

---

[28] 43:1, 16f.; 44:2, etc.

[29] Cf. e.g., 44:1; 46:3.

[30] 41:10, 14; 43:1, 5a; 44:2; 51:7; 54:4. Usually this element is missing.

[31] This element appears mostly in the perfect tense (e.g., "I have redeemed you"), but it also occurs in the imperfect (41:17b; 42:14) and in nominal sentences (43:19a).

[32] Exceptions are 49:24-26; 51:7-8; 54:4-6.

[33] Cf. 41:17 (intervention)/ v. 18f. (elaboration); 43:19a (intervention)/ v. 19b (elaboration); 44:3a (intervention)/ v. 3b (elaboration); 46:13a (intervention)/ v. 13b (elaboration).

[34] Cf. e.g., 54:10; 43:4a.

[35] 41:8-13 (v. 10/v. 11); 41:14-16 (v. 15a/v. 15b); 42:14-17 (v.16/v. 17); 43:16-21 (v. 19/v. 20); 44:1-5 (v. 3/v.4); 49:8-10 (v. 9a/v. 9b); 49:11-13 (v. 11/v. 12); 49:14-21 (v. 19a/v. 17); 49: 22-23 (v. 22a/v. 22b); 55:3b-5 (v. 4/v. 5).

C. the purpose of Yahweh's intervention.[36]

Von Waldow recognizes that modification of the form occurs. For example, member A sometimes takes the form of a direct comment or disputation on the complaint uttered in the lament psalm.[37] 51:17-23, 55:1-5, 54:11-17, and 51:9-15 are other examples of modification of the form.[38] Nevertheless, in von Waldow's opinion the form is not blurred, so there is no reason to believe that the form is being used in a setting other than the original one.[39]

Begrich and von Waldow agree that Deutero-Isaiah's salvation speeches are derived from the cultic salvation oracle whose structure is: (a) Yahweh's intervention, (b) consequences of Yahweh's intervention, and (c) purpose of Yahweh's intervention. The differences in formal structure are to be seen in von Waldow's attempt to postulate a more complex original form than the one suggested by Begrich--chiefly by means of his distinction between the elaboration of Yahweh's intervention (in member A) and the consequences of Yahweh's intervention (member B). Von Waldow's belief that every salvation speech in Deutero-Isaiah reflects this structure led him to conclude that the form is not used in Deutero-Isaiah apart from its original setting.

---

[36] 41:16b, 20; 43:7b, 21; 49:23c, 26b; 55:5b.

[37] 49:14-21, 24-26; 54:4-6; 42:14-17. In 51:7-8 member A is also modified to deal directly with the complaint. Cf. von Waldow, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-18.

[38] Cf. von Waldow's discussion, *op. cit.*, pp. 21ff.

[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 26-27.

Von Waldow's analysis is overly fine, in my opinion. For example, the distinction between the elaboration of Yahweh's intervention expressed in the first person with Yahweh as grammatical subject and the consequences of Yahweh's intervention, in which Yahweh is never the subject, cannot be sustained as a formal principle. To be sure, the shift in subject often occurs in those clauses which elaborate in detail upon the general expression of Yahweh's intervention, but the style is too fluid to make this subject change a formal category. In 41:8-13, for example, Yahweh appears as the grammatical subject, but only in the clauses with general content reflecting the intervention proper (v. 10). The elaboration of those general clauses does not have Yahweh as grammatical subject at all (v. 11-12). 41:14-16 and 44:1-5, on the other hand, betray the shift in subject. But in 41:17-20, Yahweh is the grammatical subject throughout. Several other texts do not reflect von Waldow's distinction between elaboration of Yahweh's intervention and consequences of that intervention.[40]

Moreover, von Waldow's necessity to have a rigid form necessitates unworkable distinctions between Yahweh's intervention and the elaboration of that intervention.[41] Can 44:3a really be distinguished as intervention over against v. 3b as elaboration? And is not the distinction just as arbitrary between 46:13a and v. 13b?

---

[40] 46:3-4, 12-13; 49:24-26; 54:4-6.

In my opinion, von Waldow has been unsuccessful in demonstrating the existence of one rigid form to which all of Deutero-Isaiah's salvation speeches conform. The fact that some speeches contain "Fear not!" and some do not, that some are highly disputational and some are not, and that other diversities occur, suggests that we do not have one speech-form still employed in its original setting. In fact, the tendency of certain salvation speeches to become arguments counteracting the complaint instead of simply promising deliverance gives weight to Begrich's view that these particular speeches, if not all of Deutero-Isaiah's salvation speeches, were not uttered in the cult. There is no evidence at all that the cultic answer to the lament psalm was uttered in disputational style. It is more likely that Deutero-Isaiah, speaking to the special situation of doubt in the exile, combined disputation style with the language of salvation speech.

The variety in Deutero-Isaiah's speeches of salvation causes us not only to reject von Waldow's position, but also to question whether Begrich's derivation of all of Deutero-Isaiah's salvation speeches from one basic form[42] is correct. Westermann[43] calls to attention the distinctions between Begrich's 1934 article and his Studien zu Deuterojesaja. Westermann agrees with Begrich that six texts, which were discussed by Begrich in 1934, display the form of the oracle used in the cult to proclaim salvation to an individual.[44] The structure is essentially the one seen by Begrich; it opens with direct address, with Jacob and Israel in parallelism, and the assurance of salvation (Heilszuspruch), expressed by "Fear not!" The direct address and assurance of salvation are substantiated by two kinds of clauses. The first of these signifies that Yahweh has turned his attention to the supplicant and this type of clause employs nominal sentences.[45] The second type of substantiating clause contains statements that Yahweh has now turned to intervene on the supplicant's behalf. This type appears in the form of verbal sentences in the perfect tense.[46] Yahweh is always the subject of these verbs and they are general in their content. The tense structure then changes, and the consequences (Folge) of Yahweh's intervention, found in the imperfect tense, are spelled out in concrete fashion.[47] This section of the speech-form Westermann calls the announcement of salvation (Heilsankuendigung). Then the purpose of Yahweh's intervention may (or may not) appear.[48]

---

[41] I refer here to the distinctions between member A and member B.

---

[42] Or perhaps two: the salvation oracle directed to the individual supplicant and the oracle which answers the communal lament.

[43] "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," EvTh 24 (1964), pp. 355-373, and Sprache und Struktur der Prophetie Deuterojesajas, in Forschung am alten Testament, Theologische Buecherei, Band 24 (Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1964), pp. 117-124.

[44] 41:8-13, 14-16; 43:1-4, 5-7; 44:1-5; (54:4-6).

[45] E.g., "I am with you" (41:10; 43:5); "I am your God" (41:10; 43:3).

In Westermann's view, the rigidity of the structure of these texts indicates that they exhibit a particular Gattung. He agrees with Begrich that Lamentations 3:57 (and presumably other correspondences to the lament psalm) point to a cultic Sitz im Leben. Westermann adds evidence from the Near East--a lamentation of Ashurbanipal which is followed by an oracle whose form is similar to texts in Deutero-Isaiah:

> Kneeling, Ashurbanipal sits on his lower legs, turns again to his lord Nabu:
> "I have gained you much; leave me not!
> My life is inscribed before you, my soul given over into the womb of Ninlil;
> I have gained you much, Almighty Nabu; leave me not in my need!"

---

[46] 41:10b, 14b; 43:1b.

[47] 41:11-12, 15-16, etc.

[48] 41:16b; 43:7; 44:5.

> A puff of wind (?) from his lord Nabu answers:
> "Fear not, Ashurbanipal, I will grant you a long life..."[49]

The texts added by Begrich in his Studien zu Deuterojesaja are too varied, in Westermann's opinion, to be derived from the form just discussed. They lack "Fear not!" and often the direct address. Often they are in the plural instead of the singular, reflecting a connection with the communal lament psalm. They lack the expression of Yahweh's intervention as a substantiating clause in the perfect tense. Instead, Yahweh's turning to help and his intervention are expressed in the imperfect. In view of these differences, Westermann postulates another form: (1) reference to the complaint, (2) announcement of salvation, including sentences of Yahweh's turning to help and direct statements of his intervention and its consequences, and (3) the purpose of Yahweh's intervention.[50] These speeches, in Westermann's view, are self-contained speech units.

Up to this point Westermann's position can be summarized as follows: Deutero-Isaiah employs for certain speeches[51] the form of the salvation oracle used to answer an individual lament psalm. The very general tone of the assurance of salvation and its substantiation indicates the technical means appropriate to the priest.[52] Thus originally the assurance of salvation was a priestly function. The prophet Deutero-Isaiah in his imitation of that form apparently[53] adds to it the announcement of salvation,[54] whose concreteness with regard to Israel's specific situation in the exile indicates the work of a prophet. Moreover, Deutero-Isaiah uses this form, addressed in its original setting to an individual, to address the whole people. In addition to his imitation of the salvation-assurance oracle[55] the prophet employs the pure salvation-announcement form (Heilsankuendigung).[56] The concreteness of the language and the variation in form allowable within it[57] indicate that, while the speech-form is related to the answer to the communal lament, the form is not actually a cultic form.

---

[49] Cf. Westermann, "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," pp. 360-361.

[50] 41:17-20; 42:14-17; 43:16-21; 45:14-17; 49:7-12. Cf. Westermann, "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," pp. 365-366.

[51] 41:8-13, 14-16; 43:1-4, 5-7; 44:1-5; 54:4-6.

---

[52] Westermann, "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," p. 372.

[53] Westermann's meaning is not absolutely clear to me at this point. Cf. "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," p. 372, par. 2.

[54] I refer here to the portion dominated by the imperfect tense.

[55] By "salvation-assurance oracle" I mean the salvation-assurance proper (Heilszuspruch) plus the announcement of salvation (Heilsankuendigung). Cf. 41:8-13, 14-16; 43:1-4, 5-7; 44:1-5; 54:4-6.

[56] 41:17-20; 42:14-17; 43:16-21; 45:14-17; 49:7-12.

[57] Cf. the discussion of Westermann, "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," p. 372.

Not only does Westermann hypothesize that Deutero-Isaiah uses the announcement of salvation by itself in self-contained speech units as well as the salvation-assurance oracle; he also believes that Deutero-Isaiah has used the basic structure of the announcement of salvation combined with elements of other Gattungen to create larger poetic units whose structure is not strictly molded according to the pattern of any one Gattung. 49:14-26 is a good example of Westermann's view:[58] The reference to the complaint occurs in v. 14. Then the announcement of salvation follows. Yahweh announces his having turned to help in vv. 15-16 and his intervention in vv. 17ff. The salvation-announcement is, however, thoroughly intertwined with disputational elements, which are designed to overcome the force of the complaint reflected in v. 14. The above structure repeats itself in vv. 21-23 and vv. 24-26. V. 21 contains the doubting question of the surprised mother, against which the salvation-announcement in vv. 22-23[59] serves as an argument. In vv. 24-26, v. 24 is the doubting question, to which disputational language and salvation-announcement are fused together as an argument (vv. 25-26).

---

[58] Ibid., pp. 366-368.

[59] Vv. 22-23a (intervention); v. 23b (purpose).

The three parts of this long poem are tied together, in Westermann's view, not only by content, but also by their adherence to the pattern of the lament psalm structure. Each part is a disputation on a different part of the complaint psalm--vv. 14ff. on the complaint against Yahweh,[60] vv. 21ff. on the complaint about what is befalling the person or community,[61] and v. 24ff. on the complaint against the enemy.[62] In this way, suggests Westermann, Deutero-Isaiah has remolded traditional Gattungen in accordance with his own purposes.[63]

Westermann is correct, in my opinion, that the Deutero-Isaianic speeches in the second person singular which contain אל תירא are to be separated form critically from the rest of the prophet's salvation speeches. The original Sitz im Leben for these speeches is as the answer to the individual lament psalm.[64] The correspondences with the lament psalm have already been shown by Begrich.[65] Moreover, the oracle to Ashurbanipal[66] shows such an oracle in its real Sitz im Leben, for here we have an individual lament followed by an oracle of this literary type. We have also an example in the Old Testament of our Gattung clearly set in the context of the individual lament. In Genesis 21:17-18[67] such an oracle is an answer to an individual lament. Hagar's weeping (v. 16) is to be understood as the utterance of an individual lament.[68] God hears, and as an answer sends his messenger who says, "Fear not!" Then שמע , a verb with very general meaning, appears in the perfect tense in a substantiating clause to אל־תיראי . This assurance of salvation is then expanded concretely by a clause in the imperfect (v. 18).

---

[60] "Yahweh has forsaken me."

[61] "I was bereaved and barren."

[62] "Can prey be taken from a tyrant?"

[63] Cf. also Westermann's discussion of 51:9-52:2 and chapters 54-55 in "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," pp. 368ff.

[64] Westermann is correct that this form is to be distinguished from those speeches in which "Fear not!" is used in a theophany (Gn. 15:1; 26:24; 46:3; Ju. 6:23; Dan. 10:8ff.; Mk. 14:28). This distinction is overlooked by Hyacinthe M. Dion, "The 'Oracle of Salvation,'" CBQ 29 (1967), pp. 198-206.

Having tried to establish the independence of the salvation-assurance oracle as a Gattung not to be confused with other types of salvation speech, we must now ask whether their occurrence in Deutero-Isaiah is a case of imitation of a non-prophetic Gattung or a genuine cult-prophetic speech-form (von Waldow). The question of the role of the priest and that of the prophet in relation to the cult remains unsolved, as well as the relation of each office to the other, and this question is far too complex for us to examine here. But certain observations can be made about the problem as it relates to the salvation-assurance oracles. The view of Begrich and Westermann that this oracle was originally derived from a technical, and thus priestly, means of revelation is open to question. Particularly unlikely is Westermann's view that the general tone of the assurance of salvation proper indicates the technical means of the priest and that the announcement of salvation in the imperfect tense, following hard on the heels of the assurance of salvation, is a Deutero-Isaianic addition of a prophetic Gattung to a priestly speech-form in order to speak concretely of the situation of the exile. Every example of the salvation-assurance oracle outside Deutero-Isaiah contains a section which elaborates on the general statements of Yahweh's intervention.[69] It is almost certain, therefore, that the concrete announcement of Yahweh's acts in the future belongs to the Gattung in its original form. Whether it was uttered by a priest or prophet, however, is not so clear.

---

[65] Begrich, "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel," pp. 82ff.

[66] Falkenstein-von Soden, op. cit., p. 293.

[67] Westermann, "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," p. 360.

[68] In Ju. 21:2 the phrase, "They lifted up their voices and wept" appears, clearly referring here to the lament that follows (v. 3).

The view of Begrich and Westermann that the salvation-assurance oracle in Deutero-Isaiah is an imitation because it employs a speech-form originally used for an individual to apply to the whole people is also open to question. It seems almost certain that some of the "individual laments," speaking form critically, were uttered in situations reflecting the need of the whole people.[70] Moreover, outside Deutero-Isaiah this *Gattung* is addressed to Jacob-Israel (Jeremiah 30:10=46:27). So it is unlikely that Deutero-Isaiah has used this speech-form to address a group different from the one to whom it applied in its original setting.

---

[69] Je. 46:27 (27b), 28 (28b) = Je. 30:10-11 (a conflation of two oracles); Gn. 21:17-18 (18b). The oracle to Ashurbanipal also has concrete promises.

It is difficult to determine whether Deutero-Isaiah's salvation-assurance oracles are imitations. The fact that almost all of our Israelite examples of the *Gattung* are found in prophetic texts rather than in cultic literature means that it is very difficult to determine whether Deutero-Isaiah has modified the original form. To be sure, some of the appositions to the direct address appear to be attributable to Deutero-Isaiah's own particular style,[71] but some of the material in the appositions might well be a part of the original Gattung.[72]

---

[70] Cf. e.g., Ps. 7 (vv. 8, 9); 54 (v. 5); 56 (v. 8); 59 (vv. 6, 9); 102 (vv. 13-18).

[71] I refer to phrases such as "whom I chose" (41:8, 9; 44:1, 2) and "your creator." Appeal to Yahweh as creator of Israel is notably absent from the lament psalms. Moreover, the fact that Deutero-Isaiah employs language about Yahweh as creator in such appositions in other *Gattungen* reinforces the notion that this is Deutero-Isaiah's own style. Cf. 44:24-28 and 45:1-7.

[72] The appearance of עבדי in the non-Deutero-Isaianic context Je. 46:27-28 suggests that this particular apposition may be native to the *Gattung* in its cultic setting.

Moreover, we cannot rule out the possibility that even in cultic usage the cultic official (priest or prophet?) felt free to include appositions in his own style without really modifying the Gattung, much as a modern supplicant may or may not add attributive clauses to the direct address in a prayer without doing violence to that Gattung or wrenching it from its original Sitz im Leben.

A closer look at the speeches in Deutero-Isaiah, however, suggests that the appositions concerning Yahweh as creator stand outside the framework of the original Gattung. In each case the appositions naming Yahweh as creator occur as expansions of the messenger formula (43:1; 44:2), and in 41:8-13, 14-16, where no messenger formula occurs, the appositions naming Yahweh as creator do not appear. The same is true of Jeremiah 30:10, 11= 46:27-28. This observation becomes significant when one notices that the direct address appears twice in 44:1-5--in the introduction (vv. 1-2a) and in the assurance of salvation proper (v. 2b). One suspects that this is an indication that the introduction is not a part of the original salvation-assurance oracle form, and is thus a sign of our prophet's own work. Therefore, if the introduction, which includes the messenger formula, is not original to the Gattung, it is significant that the appositions naming Yahweh as creator occur always in the introduction. It would of course be foolhardy to place too much weight on conclusions drawn from so little evidence. Nevertheless, the fact that the appositions to the direct address naming Yahweh as creator are reminiscent of similar style in other Gattungen in Deutero-Isaiah and that they occur in the introduction to the oracle, which seems to be a modification of the Gattung of the salvation-assurance oracle, hints at the possibility that Deutero-Isaiah's use of this Gattung may be imitative activity. The fact that Deutero-Isaiah felt free to use types of salvation speech other than the cultic salvation-assurance oracle (as we shall see below) gives added weight to the suggestion that his salvation-assurance oracles are imitations.

Whether or not Deutero-Isaiah's salvation-assurance oracles are imitations is not completely clear, but it is obvious that they exhibit a Gattung which can be isolated from the context by form. Now we must turn to the rest of Deutero-Isaiah's salvation speeches. Do they exhibit one Gattung? Or do we have several types? Moreover, are all of them self-contained units? Or are some, as Westermann suggests, parts of longer poetic compositions?

Turning first to the question as to whether we have more than one formal pattern, it is necessary to begin by observing that Begrich's three-fold structure of divine intervention, consequences (or elaboration) of intervention, and purpose of intervention is not adequate to pinpoint a Gattung with precision. Even the salvation-assurance oracles, whose Sitz im Leben can be defined precisely, fit this general structure, along with other Deutero-Isaianic speech types labeled speeches of salvation.

We have in Deutero-Isaiah, in my opinion, more than one type of salvation speech among those speeches which are not salvation-assurance oracles. 41:17-20 and 42:14-17, for example, reflect a form of speech not found elsewhere in Deutero-Isaiah. They begin with Yahweh's reference to the complaint uttered in the psalm (41:17a; 42:14a), then continue with a statement of Yahweh's intervention, expressed in general terms by verbs in the imperfect with Yahweh as subject (41:17b; 42:14b). Then follows an elaboration of what Yahweh's intervention will accomplish, appearing also in the imperfect (41:18-19; 42:15-17).[73] In both of these speeches Yahweh speaks of Israel in the third person plural throughout. We apparently have reflected in these two texts a cultic Gattung used to answer the communal lament, as Psalm 12 shows. The oracle in that psalm speaks of Israel in third person plural, and the same form appears; reference to the complaint (v. 6aα), announcement of Yahweh's intervention, expressed in the imperfect with Yahweh as subject (v. 6aβ), and the elaboration of that intervention (v. 6b).[74]

41:17-20 and 42:14-17, whose Sitz im Leben appears to be in the cult, can be distinguished in form from certain other speeches, such as 43:16-21, 45:14-17, 46:1-4, or 46:12-13. Each of these texts must be examined in detail. I am content here to point out that form critical analysis of Deutero-Isaiah's salvation speeches is a complex matter. Even when the salvation-assurance oracles are excluded from consideration, the rest of Deutero-Isaiah's salvation speeches--even those which Westermann considers to be separate units of tradition, such as 43:16-21--cannot be viewed from the standpoint of one simple form, as Westermann sees the matter.[75]

---

[73] 41:17-20 also contains the purpose of Yahweh's intervention (v. 20).

[74] Or perhaps v. 6b is part of the general intervention, and the elaboration is missing.

Finally, we must observe that this lack of formal uniformity, combined with the similarity in theme of passages such as 49:14-26, necessitates serious consideration of Westermann's view that some of Deutero-Isaiah's salvation speeches are long poetic compositions. This will be taken up as each passage is analyzed separately.

B. FORM IN RELATION TO CONTEXT

1. 41:8-13, 14-16, 17-20. 41:8-13 conforms to the structure of the cultic salvation-assurance oracle. The direct address (with expansions) appears in vv. 8-9. "Fear not!" with parallel clause is present in v. 10, substantiated by nominal sentences (v. 10a) and verbs in the perfect tense expressing Yahweh's having turned to intervene in a very general way (v. 10b). The elaboration (or consequences)

---

[75] Westermann, "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," pp. 365-366.

of Yahweh's intervention appears in vv. 11-12, introduced by הן .[76] The substantiation appears again in v. 13. Vv. 8-13 constitute a complete formal unit. Not only do we have a formal unit from the point of view of form, but the content is tightly integrated. Throughout, the verbs חזק (vv. 9, 13) and עזר (vv. 10, 13) are related to Yahweh's help for Israel, and the subject of the elaboration of Yahweh's intervention is the enemies of Israel.

Vv. 14-16 make up a new formal unit to be distinguished from vv. 8-13 by form and content. The entire structure of the salvation-assurance oracle is present: "Fear not!" (v. 14a), the direct address (v. 14a), the verbs expressing Yahweh's intervention, appearing in the perfect tense (v. 14b), the elaboration of Yahweh's intervention, beginning with הנה (v.15-16a), and the purpose of Yahweh's intervention (v. 16b). The content also points to a self-contained speech. The addressee is in the second feminine singular, as opposed to the masculine singular in vv. 8-13. And the elaboration of Yahweh's intervention has Israel, as opposed to her enemies in vv. 8-13, as the subject. Finally, vv. 14-16 are dominated by the imagery of Israel as a threshing sledge. Thus vv. 8-13 and vv. 14-16 are two formal units side by side.

Vv. 17-20 have already been discussed briefly above. These verses can be isolated from their context as a Gattung. Yahweh announces salvation for Israel, with the latter referred to in the third person plural. The form is as follows: reference to the complaint (v. 17a), statement of Yahweh's intervention, expressed in the imperfect tense (v. 17b), the elaboration of Yahweh's intervention (vv. 18-19), and the purpose of Yahweh's intervention (v. 20). As we have already seen, the same structure is present in Isaiah 42:14-17 and Psalm 12:6. From Psalm 12 we can see that we have before us a Gattung at home in the cult--an oracle form which is used as an answer to the communal lament psalm. The form and Sitz im Leben of vv. 17-20 permit us to isolate these verses from their context. Furthermore, the content has to do with the creation of a paradise in the wilderness. This imagery contrasts sharply with the language of the surrounding context.

---

[76] Cf. 41:15; Je. 46:27=30:10.

Thus we are confronted with three speeches of salvation, each of which separates itself from its context by form and content. If this is true, what follows regarding the context? Do we have three originally separate units which have been placed side by side by a collector? Or are they parts of a longer poetic composition, in which cultic speech-forms are imitated?

For Muilenburg, 41:8-20 is a part of a longer poem 41:1-42:4, which he entitles, "The Trial of the Nations."[77]

---

[77] The Interpreter's Bible, Ed., George Arthur Buttrick, Vol. V (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), pp. 447ff.

> The literary character of the poem is determined throughout by its setting in the court of law, its formal construction, and its prevailing dramatic style. The want of transitions, the exclamations (behold, etc.), the imperatives (41:1, 21-23), the carefully wrought repetitions (e.g., strengthen, 41:6,7,13, fear not, 41:10, 13c, 14, cf. v. 5; I will help you, 41:10c,13d,14c; cf. v. 6a; behold, 41:24,29; 42:1), the directness of address to Israel (41:8ff.) and the nations (41:1ff., 21ff.), the pronouncement of the verdict (41:11, 24,29), and the climactic emphases, similar to those encountered in the preceding poem, all betray a dramatic style that binds the work into a literary unity.[78]

But the repetition of words could be the work of a collector who uses that as a principle of collection. Moreover, Muilenburg's view that 41:1-42:4 is set entirely in a court of law seems to stem mainly from his own imagination. If our view of the salvation oracles is correct that the Sitz im Leben of these three oracles is the cult, it is not legitimate to put them in the framework of the trial.

Eva Hessler sees a different kind of unity.[79] Building on the form critical analysis of Begrich and von Waldow, she acknowledges the presence of three salvation oracles, form critically speaking. From this point she goes on to note that only the first oracle (vv. 8-13) has an extended introduction and that the conclusion of the third (v. 20) surpasses in scope the conclusion of the second (v. 16b). Thus, in her opinion, the expanded introduction to vv. 8-13 serves as an introduction to all three oracles, and the conclusion of the third becomes the conclusion for all three. There is even a progression in content. Vv. 8-13 promise Israel's preservation from enemies; vv. 14-16 promise the success of Israel; vv. 17-20 promise a new world of salvation.

---

[78] Ibid., p. 447.

[79] Hessler, Gott der Schoepfer: Ein Beitrag zur Komposition und Theologie Deuterojesajas (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ernst Moritz Arndt-Universitaet at Greifswald, 1961), pp. 37-38.

This scheme, however, is not really acceptable. There are no explicit connections made in the text to show that the introduction to the first oracle covers all three. In fact, an examination of the verb חזק in the introduction (v. 9) and a glance at its use exclusively in the first oracle (v. 13) indicate that the introduction is tightly related to the first oracle, with no clear relations with the other two. Moreover, Hessler's reading v. 20 as a conclusion which heightens the previous conclusion appears to be a result of the author's imagination. No explicit connection is made in the text.

Nevertheless, the arrangement of the three oracles is not accidental. Let us therefore look once again at the text. Vv. 14-16 and vv. 17-20 are bound together by the catchword קדוש ישראל (vv. 14,16,20). Moreover, vv. 8-13 and vv. 14-16 are bound together by the catchwords אל תירא (vv. 10,13,14) and עזר (vv. 10,13,14). And it is also possible that the "double-wish" of the lament psalm of salvation for the supplicant and destruction of the enemies is a factor in the juxtaposition of vv. 8-13 and vv. 14-16.[80] But these connections are so loose that we must presume that the unity is the work of a collector.

At the same time, vv. 1-20 seem to form a meaningful collection. We have already noted in the discussion of 40:12-31 the Deutero-Isaianic juxtaposition of the questions, "Can Yahweh save/ will Yahweh save?" as a scheme of the collector.[81] Is it possible that we have the same pattern in chapter 41--the first of the double questions being dealt with in the trial speech and the second in the salvation oracles?[82] There are definite connections between vv. 1-7 and vv. 8-20, thus giving support to this double-question hypothesis. In vv. 1-7 the basis for belief in Yahweh's power to save is in his ability as creator (v. 4). The creation motif is picked up again in v. 20. In fact, the creation theme appears to form the framework of the collection. This creation theme in vv. 1-20 ends at v. 20, making an end of this unit of meaning. The previous context in chapter 40 has already been defined as a unit of meaning. The connections between vv. 1-7 and vv. 8-13 are particularly close. The way in which the nations receive help contrasts with the way in which Israel receives help from Yahweh. This contrast is made in large part through the verbs חזק (vv. 6,7, 9,13) and עזר (vv. 6,10,13). There is also a word play on קרא (vv. 4,9). Here a connection is made between Yahweh's power to summon the "generations" and his election of Israel. One might also see a word play on ירא , contrasting the nations' frantic fear (v. 5) with the admonition to Israel not to fear (v. 10). The apparent existence of the play on these four words suggests the possibility that vv. 1-7 and vv. 8-13 were originally a kerygmatic unit. It is difficult to imagine such neat contrasts between Israel and the nations by means of play on as many as four words being simply the work of a collector. The connections of vv. 14-16 and vv. 17-20 are much looser, however, and surely reflect their positioning as the work of a collector who made his arrangements on the basic theme of Yahweh as creator.

---

[80] Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja: Kapitel 40-66, ATD, Teilband 19 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966), pp. 64-65.

[81] Cf. my discussion of 40:12-31 in Chapter II.

[82] The lament psalms always ask, "Will Yahweh save?" None of them doubts that he can save. Thus the corresponding cultic salvation oracles show no reflection of a doubt as to Yahweh's ability to save.

2. 44:1-5. These verses exhibit the form of the cultic salvation-assurance oracle. After an introduction, which includes the imperative שמע and the messenger formula (vv. 1-2a), comes "Fear not!" and the direct address (v. 2b). The substantiating clause consisting of nominal sentences and verbs in the perfect tense does not appear, probably because the essence of this clause is included in the introduction.[83] The future is depicted concretely in the imperfect

---

[83] Note עשה and עזר in v. 2.

tense (vv. 3-5). These verses set themselves off from their context by form.

Now we must turn more directly to the question of context. There is no setting in Israel for salvation oracles and trial speeches to be placed side by side. Therefore, the fact that 44:1-5 is surrounded by trial speeches is due either to the work of a collector, or it is a part of a longer poem whose structure is due to the hand of the prophet himself.

We have already argued the secondary relationship of vv. 1-5 with vv. 6-8.[84] The connections between vv. 1-5 and 43:22-28, however, are much closer. The catchword connection, "Jacob-Israel," is immediately apparent (43:22; 44:1,2). Moreover, there seems to be a contrast between the extinction of sinful ancestors (43:27-28) and the abundance of posterity (44:3-5).[85] Finally, it seems possible, though not certain because of our lack of material outside prophetic texts to provide the needed controls, that ועתה is not original to the form[86] and thus is added as a connector with the preceding context.

It is not completely clear whether the connection between

---

[84] Cf. my analysis of 44:6-8 in Chapter III.

[85] Cf. Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja, p. 110.

[86] It occurs only here and in 43:1. Note my suggestion above that the Deutero-Isaianic introduction is not original to the form.

43: 22-28 and 44:1-5 is original or due to later juxtaposition. There is no connection in the history of traditions between the language about destruction (vv. 27-28)[87] and the imagery of fruitfulness of barren land (vv. 3-5). 44: 1-5 maintains throughout the theme of creation and fertility, while the theme of cultic obligation dominates 43: 22-28.[88] Thus the connection in imagery is only at the point of ancestors and posterity. These discontinuities in form and content suggest that the connection is secondary, although we cannot be certain.

3. 43: 1-7. The form critical problems connected with these verses have presented unusual difficulties in the history of research. Since Begrich, all have seen that elements of the form of the salvation-assurance oracle are reflected. The appearance of אל תירא and the substantiations כי גאלתיך (v. 1b) and אתך אני (vv. 2,5) makes that clear. But the overall structure of these verses has produced significant disagreement. Begrich views vv. 1-7 as one speech in two parts (vv. 1-3, 3b-7).[89] Von Waldow[90] arrives at another scheme

---

[87] חלל, חרם, גדופים.

[88] Even חלל is often used in connection with the sanctuary and the question of clean-unclean (e.g., Ex. 20:25; Lv. 19:8; 21:12,23). Here it is used in connection with the princes of the sanctuary.

[89] V. 5a is deleted as a variant. Cf. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 12.

[90] Cf. von Waldow, op. cit., p. 15.

consisting of two complete oracles by rearranging the text slightly (vv. 1-3a, 5a3b-7).[91] Westermann[92] suggests that we have one speech in two parts (vv. 1-4, 5-7). In vv. 1-4, following the exhortation, "Fear not!" and the nominal and perfect-tense substantiations (v. 1b),[93] the concrete announcement of the future[94] appears. In vv. 5-7 the same structure is evident.

None of these solutions is wholly satisfactory. The omissions and rearrangements of the text by Begrich and von Waldow are arbitrary and thus not convincing. Moreover, Westermann's division into two formally-complete oracles (though one unit of tradition) is unsatisfactory because vv. 3b-4 do not fit the structure of the salvation-assurance oracle. Vv. 1-3a correspond to the structure which can be seen in other speeches: (1) "Fear not!" and substantiating clauses expressed by general verbs in the perfect tense (v. 1b),[95] and (2) the elaboration of Yahweh's intervention expressed by verbs in the imperfect

---

[91] Vv. 1-3a: vv. 1a-1bα (introduction and intervention), v. 1bβ (substantiation), v. 2 (elaboration). Vv. 5a3b-7: v. 5a (introduction), v. 3b (intervention), v. 4a (substantiation), vv. 4b, 5b-7 (elaboration).

[92] Das Buch Jesaja, p. 95.

[93] I refer here to the assurance of salvation proper (Heilszusage).

[94] Heilsankuendigung.

[95] Member 1 follows the introduction in v. 1a.

(v. 2), followed by another substantiating clause.[96] The elaboration of Yahweh's intervention is an announcement of Yahweh's protective presence while Israel passes through fire and water. In vv. 3b-4 the imagery shifts completely to a promise that Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba will serve as a ransom for Israel (v. 3b). This promise is accompanied by its own substantiating clause (v. 4). In none of the other examples of the salvation-assurance oracle do we have such a double structure for the elaboration of Yahweh's intervention. Furthermore, a comparison of 43:3a with 41:13 suggests that 43:3a marks the end of a formal unit.

In my opinion, therefore, 43:1-7 falls into three parts. Vv. 1-3a, as we have seen, displays the form of the salvation-assurance oracle. The same is true of vv. 5-7. "Fear not!" plus the substantiating clause expressing Yahweh's intervention appear in v. 5a, and the elaboration of Yahweh's intervention may be seen in vv. 5b-6. The purpose of Yahweh's intervention is found in v. 7. This leaves vv. 3b-4 to be explained form critically. V. 3b is a statement of Yahweh's intervention, and v. 4 is the substantiation of v. 3b. Even though v. 3b is in the perfect tense, it does not have the general meaning of the verbs in the salvation-assurance oracle which serve as the substantiation of "Fear not!" Moreover, the perfect tense occurs in the concrete announcement of salvation elsewhere.[97] In fact, the structure of vv. 3b-4 is similar to that of vv. 14-15. Both have the concrete announcement of the future in the perfect tense,[98] as well as a statement which gives a rationale for the announcement.[99] Thus vv. 3b-4, viewed form critically, have a degree of independence from their context.

---

[96] Cf. 41:13 for another example of a substantiating clause at the end.

The separation of vv. 1-7 into three formal units is reinforced by an examination of the content. In vv. 1-3a Israel is promised that Yahweh will be with them during the ordeal of fire and water. This imagery is rounded off, however, by the closing substantiation (v. 3a), for vv. 3b-4, without an explicit transition, betray a shift in imagery in the announcement that Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba will be given by Yahweh as a ransom in exchange for Israel's life. Again in vv. 5-7 the imagery shifts without explicit transition to the promise that Yahweh will gather Israel from the four directions.

In spite of the fact that vv. 1-7 can be isolated into three parts on the basis of both form and content, we must not overlook the fact that the text as it now stands is a kerygmatic unity. The way in which

---

[97] 41:15; 43:14b; 51:6.

[98] The perfect tense is augmented by waw plus the perfect in v. 14.

[99] V. 4 substantiates v. 3b. למענכם substantiates the following announcement of the future.

קרא, בשם, ברא, and יצר are used in vv. 1 and 7 shows that these verses are to be taken together in the final form of the text. But if we have a kerygmatic unity, how can we at the same time hold out for the presence of three speech-forms? Vv. 1-3a and vv. 5-6 (7) are held together by formal similarities, which include the catchwords אל תירא and אתך אני .

Vv. 1-3a and vv. 3b-4 are linked together by the idea of redemption.[100] It is also quite likely that the return home (vv. 5-6) and the announcement of Israel's salvation through the ransom of Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba (vv. 3b-5) were easily associated with one another. In specifically Zion-oriented traditions, nations such as these play a role in connection with the return home.[101] The masculine singular of both vv. 3b-4 and vv. 5-6 steers us away, however, from associating these verses too closely with the complex of Zion traditions. Moreover, in Deutero-Isaiah we have no evidence for associating the tradition of the return from the various parts of the compass with Zion.[102] But if the compiler of 43:1-7 was familiar with Deutero-Isaiah's use of the Zion traditions, the associations made between the apparently non-Zion vv. 3b-4 and vv. 5-7 would have arisen out of his knowledge of those

---

[100] גאלתיך (v. 1); כפרך (v. 3b).

[101] Cf. 45:14-17; 49:22-23; 60:1ff.

[102] Cf. 43:5-6; 49:12.

Zion traditions.

It now seems clear that 43: 1-7 is a kerygmatic unity. Whether it is the work of a collector or an original composition is not certain. The overbalanced line in v. 7 suggests that we have to do with a collector who tries to relate the end to the beginning, but the evidence is not clear enough for certainty. We may be relatively sure, however, that we have a kerygmatic unity made up of three speech-forms.

Turning now to the question of the surrounding context, we see that 43: 1-7 appears to be connected in some way with the preceding context (42: 18-25) by the common theme of fire. What is the significance of this? Is it a sign of a larger poetic composition? Or is it the sign of a thematic connection resulting from a collection of originally separate speeches? And if the latter is the case, is there any kerygmatic significance in their juxtaposition, or do we have only a loose thematic connection?

The connection between the two passages cannot be accounted for by means of form critical association. The salvation oracle speech-form found in 43:1-3a, 5-7 is the answer to the individual lament psalm and has no real-life connection with disputation speech. The most prominent connection between them, therefore, is a content connection--the image of fire and burning. The question before us is whether the connection is primary or secondary.

Let us first note the discontinuities between the two passages.

In 42: 18-25 only fire is mentioned, while both fire and water appear in 43: 1-7. Moreover, in the former, the fire is the result of Yahweh's wrath and is connected with battle imagery. And Israel was burned by the fire. In 43: 1ff., on the other hand, both fire and water are mentioned, and there is no indication that the fire and water are to be understood as punishment for Israel's disobedience. In fact, 43:2, in contrast to 42:25, indicates that Israel will not be burned. Another discontinuity between 42: 18-25 and 43: 1-7 is the fact that the latter is organized under the theme of Israel as created and called by name by Yahweh. The former has no mention of this theme, but instead concentrates on the theme of the blindness and deafness of Israel, Yahweh's disobedient servant. The emphasis on Israel as servant in 42: 18-25 is striking, and one might expect it to reappear in 43: 1-7 if 42: 18-43:7 were an original unity, particularly since similar salvation-assurance speeches often refer to Israel as servant.[103] To be sure, one might wonder whether these discontinuities necessarily imply that the two passages were originally separate. Could not a poet have made such transitions as he shifted from imitation of one Gattung to the imitation of another? Of course this would not be impossible. Nevertheless, the lack of connection along formal lines and the discontinuities in content place restraints on an uncritical acceptance of the two passages as an original unity.

---

[103] 41:8, 9; 44: 1-2; Je. 46: 27-28=30: 10.

In spite of the discontinuities, I think it is possible to maintain that the juxtaposition of the two passages has kerygmatic significance. The disputation in 42: 18-25 is for Israel's profit--that they may see (v. 18) and hear for the sake of the future (v. 23). Furthermore, ועתה connects 43: 1-7 with the preceding context.[104] Thus the juxtaposition of the two passages connects the present plight of Israel with the hope for the future. The fire (and water) is a situation of punishment, but still a circumstance in which Yahweh's redeeming presence can be seen. The kerygmatic unity of this passage becomes even more obvious when 42: 18-43: 7 is compared with the surrounding context. The connection with 42:14-17 is only by the catchword עורים (v. 16), and that seems to be only a mechanical catchword connection. In 42:14-17 the condition of blindness is in no way a result of disobedience, as in 42:18-25. Instead, the blind are the needy in the typical cultic language of the psalms. Turning to the following context (43:8-13), the words "blind" and "deaf" occur, and here the blind and deaf, as in 42:18-25, are summoned for a different future--that they might "know" and "believe" and "understand" (43:10). But the scene in 43:8-13 is completely different from 42:18-43:7. Israel's complaint of abandonment is not disputed, as in 42:18ff., but rather their doubt that Yahweh instead of the foreign gods has the power to save. In 42:18ff., Yahweh argues that Israel's sin has caused their plight; in 43:8-13 the ראשנות are central as a means for arguing that Yahweh is able to save. Thus the connection of 43:8-13 to the preceding context is only by catchword and loose thematic similarities.

---

[104] I have already suggested under 44:1-5 that ועתה is not an original part of the salvation-assurance form.

In summary, I have tried to demonstrate that 42:18-43:7 is a kerygmatic unity composed of two completely separable formal units (42:18-25; 43:1-7), the latter of which can be broken down further (vv. 1-3a, 3b-4, 5-7). None of the parts of 43:1-7 can stand alone, however, in the present text. Whether or not they are a reworking of three originally separate speeches is not clear. 42:18-25 and 43:1-7 could conceivably have stood independent of each other, as the discontinuities might suggest. We cannot be certain of that, however. At any rate, it does seem certain that they may be read together in their present context as a message unit.

4. 43:14-15, 16-21. Vv. 14-15 stand out from their context by form. The passage begins with the messenger formula, expanded in hymnic style (v. 14a). Then follows the promise, "For your sake I have sent to Babylon, and I will bring down the fugitives[105]--all of them." The speech closes with an asyndeton substantiating clause (v. 15).[106] The form differs from that of the salvation-assurance oracle. "Fear not!"

---

[105] Or "bars" (cf. 45:2). No satisfactory solution has been found for the reading of this text.

[106] Cf. 41:13 and 43:3a for closing substantiating clauses.

is absent. Moreover, it is addressed to a masculine plural audience. Whether it is a complete oracle or a fragment is not clear, partly because it cannot be translated with certainty.[107] However that may be, the formal similarity with 43:3b-4 noted above indicates that it is a complete formal unit. As with 43:3b-4, the Sitz im Leben of the form is not clear (prophetic or cultic?), but the formal similarity between 43:3b-4 and vv. 14-15 shows that vv. 14-15 can be distinguished from the surrounding context form critically.

Vv. 16-21 also make up a formal unit. The passage opens with a messenger formula, expanded by hymnic clauses which refer to the Exodus (vv. 16-17). Following an exhortation not to remember Yahweh's saving deeds of the past (v. 18), the prophet has Yahweh announce the saving deeds of the future (vv. 19-20abα). The purpose of Yahweh's action is presented in vv. 20bβ-21.

The fact that this speech begins with a messenger formula, closes with the purpose of Yahweh's intervention, and contains the announcement of the future by Yahweh indicates that this speech is complete form critically. The unity of content, reflected in the Exodus-wilderness theme, serves as additional support for isolating this speech from the surrounding context. But what kind of a Gattung is it? Is it cultic, or is it genuinely prophetic? Begrich understands it as a free Deutero-Isaianic imitation of the cultic answer to the communal lament.[108] The exhortation, "Fear not!" is transformed into the imperative, "Remember not!" This is to be explained, says Begrich, by Deutero-Isaiah's situation in history. Instead of encouraging the people not to be paralyzed by the fear that is bound up with their need, Deutero-Isaiah exhorts them not to be hindered by a fixation on Yahweh's past deeds so that they cannot behold the new. Westermann agrees with Begrich that the form does not reflect usage in a real cultic situation.[109] But he does not believe that it is an imitation of the cultic oracle which begins, "Fear not!" Instead, he argues, the speech exhibits throughout the salvation-announcement (Heilsankuendigung) type of speech, with the following structure: (1) reference to the complaint (v. 18), (2) announcement of salvation (vv. 19-20), (3) purpose of Yahweh's action (v. 21).[110] V. 18, in Westermann's opinion, is a reference to the reproach of Yahweh in the lament, in which Yahweh's past gracious deeds are contrasted to the present situation of distress.

---

[107] It has been suggested that something between v. 14 and v. 15 has dropped out. Cf. Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja, pp. 102-103.

Both Begrich and Westermann are correct that this text was not uttered as a part of a cultic event. The element of disputation, seen vividly in the second stich of v. 19, indicates that the prophet is attempting to counteract a specific situation of doubt. But Begrich's view that this speech is a reworking of the cultic form that begins, "Fear not!" is questionable. As Westermann has demonstrated, there is more than one form of salvation speech in Deutero-Isaiah, and there are no definite traces in this text of the form which contains "Fear not!" But Westermann's structure, which is so satisfactory for 41:17-20 and 42:14-17, is not workable here. 43:16-21 addresses the supplicant in the second person rather than the third person native to the Gattung seen in 41:17-20, 42:14-17, and Psalm 12:6. To be sure, in 43:16-21 there is a reference to the complaint of the people. But in the speech-form exhibited by Isaiah 41:17-20 and Psalm 12:6 the reference to the complaint does not have disputational qualities.[111] In 43:18, however, the exhortation, "Remember not!" is intended to take issue with the people's focus on Yahweh's deeds of the past and their belief that he is no longer acting graciously.[112] Deutero-Isaiah has Yahweh argue that he is in fact acting now;[113] he is doing something new.[114] Thus it is unlikely that 43:16-21 is drawn from the same *Gattung* as 41:17-20 and 42:14-17. It is probable that, apart from the general structure of introduction, announcement of the future, and purpose of Yahweh's action which are reflected in all kinds of salvation speeches, the structure is Deutero-Isaiah's created in response to the people's doubt that Yahweh is acting in the present.

---

[108] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 13.

[109] Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja, pp. 104-106.

[110] Surely Westermann means vv. 20bβ-21!

---

[111] Isaiah 42:14-17 does exhibit disputational qualities, as will be argued below. But this is probably Deutero-Isaiah's modification of the Gattung.

[112] Cf. Ps. 77:4, 7 for an instance of the feeling of a cleavage between past and present. In this connection, see the discussion by B.S. Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel, SBT 37 (London: S.C.M. Press, 1962), pp. 60-63.

[113] "Now it springs forth; do you not know it?"

However that may be, Isaiah 43:16-21 can be isolated from its context as a complete formal unit. It is clear that from beginning to end we have to do with a promise of salvation in which the Exodus-wilderness language is used to take issue with the view of those to whom Deutero-Isaiah speaks.

Turning now to the question of the relation of vv. 14-15 and vv. 16-21 to their context, we note immediately the occurrence of ראשנות in both vv. 9 and 18. Surely this is not accidental. Does it mean that vv. 14-15 and vv. 16-21 are a part of a larger poetic composition in which *Gattungen* are imitated as the various parts? Or are we confronted by the work of a collector? The relation of vv. 14-15 and vv. 16-21 to the preceding context is illumined, I believe, by viewing it as a part of a recurring pattern in chapters 41-44. This consists of a salvation speech (or speeches) preceded by a speech which functions as a disputation--in some cases a trial speech (41:1-20; 43:22-44:5) and sometimes simply a disputation speech in form (42:18-43:7). In one case the creation theme is the unifying factor (41:1-20); in another it is the polarity of ancestors and posterity (43:22-44:5); in another it is the image of fire (42:18-43:7). Here the theme of the ראשנות provides the continuity.

---

[114] Is Deutero-Isaiah referring to the new *way* in which Yahweh acts and the doubt thereby incurred--namely, his use of Cyrus as a saving instrument? Texts like 45:9-13 might suggest such an interpretation. But 43:16-21 is not clear about this, so we must leave the question open.

The appearance of vv. 14-15 here indicates that we have to do with a collector. Not only does it separate itself from its context by form, but there is absolutely no thematic (or catchword) continuity with the *immediate* context. The use of the root גאל may provide a key to its position in the larger context 43:8-21. Just as in 42:18-43:7 the salvation speech speaks of Yahweh as Israel's redeemer in the introduction (43:1), so the salvation-speech portion of 43:8-13 begins with a similar introduction (v. 14). Another sign that we have to do with a collector is the fact that the theme of the ראשנות functions differently in vv. 8-13 and vv. 16-21. In the former the ראשנות are the point of agreement between speaker and hearers and are used as a base from which to move to the dispute about Yahweh's sovereignty over against the gods. Vv. 16-21, by contrast, show no hint of a dispute about Yahweh's power in relation to the gods. Instead, Deutero-Isaiah disputes the people's fixation on the past and their inability to perceive a new saving event which is right before their eyes.

In short, in vv. 8-13 the ראשנות function as an important positive link in an argument. In vv. 16-21, the ראשנות play a more negative role. Moreover, there is no direct kerygmatic connection between the two passages made explicitly in the text. This fact, coupled with the appearance of vv. 14-15 in between, suggests that we have to do with a collector.

George Knight has suggested that our text is related to the following context. The people whom Yahweh formed to declare his praise (v. 21) have not in fact done so (v. 22).[115] He is undoubtedly correct that the present text may be read that way. But this is probably due to the work of a collector. The imagery of "giving drink" to Yahweh's chosen people conforms with the wilderness imagery of vv. 16-21, while the rejection of Yahweh in vv. 22-28 employs the imagery of calling on Yahweh in the cult and being weary of him. Vv. 22-28 contradict a false claim to righteousness; vv. 16-21 dispute an inability to see a new saving deed.

5. 42:14-17. These verses have already been discussed briefly as a Gattung in which Yahweh announces salvation for Israel.[116] The form, in which Yahweh speaks of Israel in the third person plural, is as follows: (1) reference to the complaint (v. 14a), (2) statement of Yahweh's intervention, expressed in the imperfect tense (v. 14b),

---

[115] Knight, Deutero-Isaiah: A Theological Commentary on Isaiah 40-55 (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 103.

[116] Cf. Part A of this chapter.

and (3) elaboration of Yahweh's intervention (vv. 15-16), concluding with the summary statement, "These are the things I will do to them...." As we have already seen, we have a Gattung at home in the cult.[117] In contrast with 41:17-20 and Psalm 12:6, however, we have here an element of disputation. In Isaiah 41:17-20 and Psalm 12:6 the reference to the complaint and announcement of deliverance are not disputational at all. But in 42:14-17 the prophet has Yahweh dispute the complaint that he has been silent. Yahweh carries on the dispute by indicating that the time of silence is now past and that he will now act. Disputation with the people is common throughout Deutero-Isaiah and is probably to be seen here as his modification of the cultic Gattung for the purposes of disputing this particular complaint.

However that may be, vv. 14-17 stand out from their context by form. The same is true if the content of vv. 14-17 is compared with that of the surrounding material. The connection with the following context is secondary, as we have already seen.[118] Vv. 14-17 can be distinguished from the preceding context (vv. 10-13) not only by setting off the salvation speech from the hymn form critically, but also by virtue of the fact that vv. 10-13 focus on the language of battle, while the language of vv. 14-17 is entirely about creation in the imagery of giving birth. The discontinuities in both form and content suggest that their juxtaposition is secondary.

---

[117] In Part A I argued on the basis of Ps. 12:6 that this is a cultic Gattung.

[118] Cf. my analysis of 42:18-25 in Chapter II.

6. 45:14-17. Begrich views this speech as an imitation and transformation of the cultic salvation oracle form from which he believes all of Deutero-Isaiah's salvation speeches are derived. In his opinion, member a, the intervention of Yahweh, is missing. Only the consequences of Yahweh's intervention are present.[119] In fact, the confession in vv. 14bβ -15, in his view, is a transformation of the usual phrase, "that they may know that I alone am God."[120] In light of Westermann's critique of Begrich's derivation of all the Deutero-Isaianic salvation speeches from one cultic speech-form, the absence of both "Fear not!" and the substantiating nominal and verbal clauses with general content suggests that this speech is not an imitation of that Gattung. Moreover, the fact that it is addressed to Zion (rather than Jacob-Israel) with a particular message to her concerning the nations and that the confession is a speech put in the nations' mouth suggest that we are dealing with a different kind of salvation speech.

This speech is an example of a kind of salvation speech addressed to Zion, in which is reflected a traditionary complex in which, among other things, the nations come to Zion bringing home the exiled

---

[119] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 8.

[120] Ibid., p. 15.

Israelites (Is. 49:22ff.; 60:1ff.) and the treasures of these nations (Is. 45:14-17; 60:1ff.; Hag. 2: 7-8). These nations will bow down before Israel (Is. 45:14f.; 49:23; 60:14) or before Yahweh (45:23).[121] Certain formal features may be noted. As already mentioned, Zion is the addressee.[122] Often the nations make confession to Zion or to Yahweh, and the words of the confession are quoted (Is. 45:14-17, 24-25; 60:14).[123] To be sure, the form is flexible; yet these formal features tend to recur. Since we have no examples of this type in the cult, or for that matter, outside Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah, we must assume a prophetic, or perhaps even Deutero-Isaianic, Sitz im Leben. At any rate, the formal features of promise of the nations' pilgrimage followed by their confession set this speech off from its context. Moreover, the secondary relation to the preceding context has already been discussed,[124] as well as with the following context.[125]

---

[121] Cf. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. II, trans. by D.M.G. Stalker (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), pp. 239-240, 293ff.

[122] Is. 45:14ff.; 49:22-23, 24-26; 60:1ff. In 45:18-25 the nations are addressed.

[123] A comparison of 45:14bβ -17 with 45:24-25 indicates the likelihood that the former is in entirety the speech of the nations. The speech of the nations begins with אך (v. 14bβ , v. 24a), followed by a confession in which Yahweh is spoken of in the third person (vv. 14bβ , 15, 24a). Then Yahweh's behavior toward his opponents is contrasted with his gracious activity toward Israel (vv. 16-17, 24b-25), with Yahweh's enemies and Israel both spoken of in the third person.

[124] Cf. my discussion of 45:9-13 in Chapter II.

[125] Cf. my analysis of 45:18-25 in Chapter III.

7. *46: 1-4.* Form critically these verses separate themselves into two *Gattungen.* Vv. 1-2 are an imitation of a type of victory song.[126] This *Gattung* is exhibited elsewhere by Jeremiah 50:2b. The defeat of the foe is depicted by verbs in the perfect tense. These verbs carry the connotation of defeat and shame. If the text of 46: 1-2 is correct,[127] these verses are apparently addressed *formally*[128] to the Babylonians, as נשאתיכם shows. Vv. 3-4, on the other hand, betray the form of salvation speech. The imperative שמעו in Deutero-Isaiah often introduces a salvation speech.[129] The addressee, contrasted with vv. 1-2, is Israel, as is most often the case in salvation speeches. Finally, the announcement of the future in v. 4b types these two verses as a salvation speech.

Nevertheless, the four verses cannot be separated from one another. Vv. 3-4 differ from most of Deutero-Isaiah's salvation speeches in that the announcement of the future is depicted only in general terms, and the announcement of the future in these general terms is the climax of the speech instead of merely the substantiation as in the salvation-assurance oracles. This difference with most of Deutero-Isaianic salvation speeches can be accounted for by realizing that vv. 3-4 must be understood as a contrast to vv. 1-2. In response to Israel's doubt concerning Yahweh's saving power over against the Babylonian gods, the prophet utters a polemical speech of salvation. The Babylonian gods, who must be carried, present a sharp contrast to Yahweh, who has always carried Israel. Since Israel cannot deny this contrast, they may believe that Yahweh who has always done this in the past[130] will in the future carry and deliver. Thus 46: 1-4 is an example of Deutero-Isaiah's fusion and transformation of traditional Gattungen in ways hitherto unknown for the purpose of conveying his message to the exiles.

---

[126] Cf. Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja,* pp. 54, 56.

[127] The versions have third person suffix.

[128] It is unlikely that the prophet is actually addressing the Babylonians.

[129] Cf. e.g., 44:1; 46:3, 12; 51:1, 7.

Turning to the question of the surrounding context, we encounter significantly different views among scholars. Duhm sees no connection with the previous context, but there is, in his opinion, a continuity with the following context.[131] Chapter 45 and Chapter 46 were composed at different times, he believes. Chapter 46 (with the exception of vv. 6-8) is a literary unity. Muilenburg also sees Chapter 46 as a unified poetic composition with no direct connection with the preceding context.[132] Westermann, however, sees 46:1-4 as a part of a long poetic composition, which begins with 45:20 and continuing throughout chapter 46--a composition made up of imperatives (45:20,22; 46:3,9,12) which show the contrast between the remnant of the nations (45:20) and the remnant of Israel (46:3).[133] Begrich and von Waldow, of course, view 46:1-2 and 46:3-4 as independent speech-units. I have already tried to show that the connection of vv. 1-4 with vv. 5ff., while not totally accidental, is due to the work of a collector.[134] Now we must determine the relationship to the preceding context. There are certain continuities--the catchword כרע (45:23; 46:1,2) and the apparent thematic connection of the remnant or survivors (45:20; 46:3), as well as the theme of carrying idols (45:20; 46:1-2). But these connections are rather loose. In 46:1, 2 the gods bow down (כרע) in defeat, and the animals bow down with the weight of the gods. This is a literary device internal to 46:1-4. In 45:23, however, כרע expresses a ritual act of obeisance. Moreover, the theme of the survivors functions differently in 46:1-4 and the preceding context. In the former the remnant Israel in exile is promised that Yahweh will "carry and save." In view of the people's doubt of Yahweh's ability to carry his people, the prophet fashions a discourse contrasting the gods who must be carried with Yahweh's having carried his people. In 45: 18-25 the survivors of the nations are those who go before Yahweh to do homage. The argument presented in vv. 18-25 is that Yahweh alone is God, thus he can summon the nations to worship him. 45: 18-25 reflects a particular manifestation of a tradition of the pilgrimage of the nations to Zion.[135] The survivors of the nations have a firm place in that tradition.[136] This use of the survivors of the nations in connection with that tradition is unrelated to the idea of the remnant of Israel presented in 46:3. Furthermore, no explicit connection is made between them in the text. Thus it is likely that 45: 18-25 and 46: 1-4 were originally separate. Moreover, there is no reason to see a kerygmatic connection imposed by the collector.

---

[130] אני עשיתי.

[131] B. Duhm, Das Buch Jesaia uebersetzt und erklaert, 4th. ed., HKAT 3/1 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1922), p. 350.

---

[132] Muilenburg, op. cit., p. 535.

[133] Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, p. 152; Das Buch Jesaja, p. 144.

[134] Cf. my discussion of 46:5-11 in Chapter II.

8. 46: 12-13. The form is as follows: (1) call to hear, with imperative of שמע[137] and Israel addressed directly as sinners (v. 12), and (2) announcement of Yahweh's intervention in the perfect tense, elaborated by the equivalent of the imperfect (v. 13): "I am bringing near my righteousness" (קרבתי צדקתי) and "I will put salvation in Zion" (ונתתי בציון תשועה). This tense sequence, as we have seen, appears often in salvation speech forms. But here,

---

[135] Cf. my discussion of 45: 18-25 in Chapter III.

[136] Cf. Is. 66:19.

[137] A similar introduction appears in 44:1; 46:3; 51:1, 7.

"Fear not!" is absent. Moreover, the verb in the perfect tense is expanded by verbs in relative clauses,[138] and the clause with the verb expressing the equivalent of the imperfect is general rather than concrete in tone.[139] So it is clear that the form is not that of the salvation-assurance oracle, even though the tense sequence seems to be a sign that Deutero-Isaiah was influenced by that Gattung. The fact that the form of the salvation-assurance oracle seems to be a factor in the structure of this speech, while the overall form of the speech is not determined by that Gattung, probably indicates that this utterance is a speech formed rather freely by our prophet. In any case, the speech sets itself off from its context by form, beginning with the typical introductory imperative, followed by the announcement of salvation. The lack of continuity with the mocking song in chapter 47 is clear.[140] Its original kerygmatic connections with vv. 5-11 have already been indicated.[141]

---

[138] The verbs לא תרחק and לא תאחר are in poetic relative clauses. Contrast the perfect-tense verbs in the salvation-assurance oracles, e.g., 41:10, 14; 43:1.

[139] For a contrast with the salvation-assurance oracles, cf. 41: 11-12, 15-16; 43:2, 5b; 44: 3-5. In these texts the imperfect-tense verbs aid in painting a concrete image of the future.

[140] Or, if chapter 47 is secondary to the collection of chapters 40-55, there still remains a lack of continuity with 48: 1-11. Cf. my discussion of 48: 1-11 in Chapter II.

[141] Cf. my analysis of 46: 5-11 in Chapter II.

9. 49:14-21, 22-23, 24-26. Begrich, followed by von Waldow, holds that vv. 14-21, 22-23, and 24-26 are separate speeches.[142] For Begrich, vv. 22-23 illustrate clearly the parts of the salvation oracle.[143] V. 22a, following the messenger formula, states Yahweh's intervention. Vv. 22b-23a declare the consequences of Yahweh's intervention, and v. 23b contains the purpose of that intervention. Vv. 24-26 also display the structure of the salvation oracle.[144] The purpose of Yahweh's intervention is found in v. 26b.[145] V. 26a expresses the consequences of Yahweh's intervention. The first part of the oracle has undergone transformation. The doubting question of the communal lament is quoted (v. 24), to which Yahweh answers that the unbelievable is possible (v. 25a).[146] V. 25b, according to Begrich's scheme, is the statement of Yahweh's intervention. Vv. 14-21 also display the form of the salvation oracle, in Begrich's view. Vv. 14-15 dispute the people's complaint that Yahweh has forsaken Zion; v. 16 is the statement of Yahweh's intervention, and v. 17 expresses the

---

[142] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 6, 8, 18; von Waldow, op. cit., p. 28.

[143] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 8.

[144] Ibid., p. 8, footnote 7.

[145] Ibid., p. 10.

[146] Ibid., p. 13.

consequences of Yahweh's intervention. The second part, vv. 18-21,[147] presents member a in v. 18a. Member b is present in v. 18b, expanded by vv. 19b-21.

Westermann does not dispute the view of Begrich and von Waldow that three salvation oracle structures can be seen, even though he disagrees that they are imitations of the cultic salvation-assurance oracle. Nevertheless, in his opinion, vv. 14-26 must be seen as one poetic composition in which three salvation oracles are imitated.[148] This long poem combines the language of the disputation and the speech of salvation to argue against Zion's continuing in the state of lamentation. The poem is a three-fold disputation and promise to counter three complaints: "Yahweh has forsaken me" (v.14), "I was childless and barren" (v. 21), and, "Can booty be taken from a mighty man?" (v. 24). These three complaints, in Westermann's view, correspond to the three complaints of the cultic lament--the complaint about the lack of Yahweh's saving activity, the complaint about the woeful state of the supplicant, and the complaint about the oppression of the enemy.[149] Thus the prophet has composed a long poem using parts of the lament psalm as a model, fusing the language of disputation and speech of salvation as the answer to each of the three parts of the lament psalm.

---

[147] Ibid., p. 18.

[148] Westermann, "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," pp. 366-368. Cf. also Sprache und Struktur, pp. 121, 132-133, and Das Buch Jesaja, pp. 177ff.

[149] Westermann, "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," p. 368.

Westermann is of course correct that 49:14ff. is not simply a modification of the salvation-assurance oracle. Moreover, the fusion of disputation speech into the structure of salvation speech is undeniable. Finally, we must not overlook the thematic continuity of the return of Zion's sons as an indication that the arrangement of these verses is not accidental. But Westermann's view that this is a poem based on the three complaints of the lament psalm is not satisfactory. First of all, I cannot agree that vv. 14-26 in their entirety are formed to dispute three real complaints uttered by the people. Only vv. 14 and 24 represent real questions to be disputed. Vv. 15ff. dispute the complaint of v. 14 that Yahweh has forsaken Zion. This is accomplished by the argument in vv. 15-16 that he has continually kept Zion in his concern. This is followed by the details of his intervention (v. 17).[150] Then the return of Zion's sons is portrayed in imagination (vv. 18ff.), showing how glorious the return will be.[151] This salvation speech probably reflects a dispute on a real complaint uttered in the cult by the people. Vv. 25-26 too are probably formed as an answer to a real question, quoted in v. 24. V. 21, however, is not a real question. Instead it is an intensification of the announcement of salvation, for it shows how unbelievably wonderful Yahweh's promise is. Therefore, v. 21 must be taken as a part of the promise of v. 20 rather than an objection beginning a new disputation, as Westermann would have it.

---

[150] Read bēnayik with 1QIsa.

[151] V. 19a is perhaps corrupt; cf. the commentaries. But note 51: 2b-3 for a similar pattern of two clauses introduced by כי in which the second clause reflects a time which is to be compared with the earlier time seen in the first clause.

A second objection to Westermann's view that vv. 14-26 constitute a three-fold disputation based on the three types of complaint found in the lament psalm is posed by v. 24. Westermann, following Begrich, assumes that v. 24 is a typical question from a lament psalm.[152] But I do not believe that this is true. The lament psalm never questions the possibility of Yahweh's delivering his people from the clutches of the powerful. In fact, the appeal to Yahweh is based on the belief that Yahweh can and indeed does deliver his people. In v. 24, however, the question seems to be whether there is any reason to expect Yahweh to deliver from the clutches of the mighty.[153] The disputation in vv. 25-26 is not on a complaint derived from the cultic lament, but rather a question of doubt framed in the circumstances of the exile. Thus Westermann's view that the three complaints of the lament psalm serve as the structure for the poem 49:14-26 breaks down also at this point.

---

[152] Cf. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 13; H. Gunkel, Einleitung in die Psalmen, 2nd. ed. (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966), p. 127.

[153] In the laments the supplicant often cries, "Why?" or, "How long?" But we have no examples of a question like Is. 49:24. Even in Gunkel's discussion of Is. 49:24 (op. cit., p. 127) one is aware how unique Is. 49:24 is.

In spite of these criticisms of the position of Westermann, we must not overlook the importance of his insight that these three formal units hang together closely when compared with the surrounding context. The addressee throughout is Zion,[154] and the concern throughout is the return of sons to the bereaved mother Zion. These three texts all reflect the same kind of traditionary complex.[155] Moreover, in the present form of the text there seems to be a certain progression. Vv. 14-21 dispute the complaint in v. 14. Vv. 22-23, though not the answer to a real complaint, appear to elaborate on the means by which the bereaved mother's children are nurtured. Vv. 24-26 answer the complaint that one cannot expect deliverance from the tyrant. These three verses seem to follow naturally after vv. 22-23. Whether the present progression of the text is due to an original composer or the work of a skillful collector is not certain, but it does seem clear that we have three texts, separable form critically, which in their present context display a progression of thought.

10. 51:1-3, 4-5, 6, 7-8. Form critical research has not been

---

[154] Contrast the masculine singular in vv. 8-13 and the second masculine plural in 50:1-3.

[155] Cf. von Rad, op. cit., pp. 239-240, 293ff.

in agreement concerning 51:1-8. Mowinckel,[156] Haller,[157] Koehler,[158] and Fohrer[159] consider these verses as a unity.[160] On the other hand, Gressmann,[161] Begrich,[162] and von Waldow[163] see them as separate units. Therefore, it is necessary to re-examine these verses.

A glance at introductory formulae suggests that these verses might be broken down into the following parts: vv. 1-3, 4-5, 6, 7-8. Now we must look at each of these parts carefully from a form critical perspective to see the relation of each to the context.

---

[156] "Die Komposition des deuterojesajanischen Buches," ZAW 49 (1931), p. 108.

[157] Das Judentum, 2nd. ed., revised, SAT 2/3 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1925), pp. 58ff.

[158] Deuterojesaja stilkritisch untersucht (Giessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1923), p. 108.

[159] Das Buch Jesaja, Band 3, Zuercher Bibelkommentare (Zuerich and Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1964), pp. 141ff.

[160] Cf. also Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja, pp. 188ff., but with considerable rearranging of the text.

[161] "Die literarische Analyse Deuterojesajas," ZAW 34 (1914), p. 279.

[162] Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 5, 12, 43.

[163] von Waldow, op. cit., pp. 28, 36.

Vv. 1-3 are considered by Begrich[164] and von Waldow[165] to be a disputation speech. Those who doubt the promise of comfort to Zion are exhorted to look to the past (vv. 1b-2). Since an Israelite would not doubt Yahweh's saving activity in the past, the prophet can now move confidently to speak of Yahweh's activity on Zion's behalf in the present and future (v. 3). The disputational character of these verses is clear. Moreover, we note that the language of salvation speech (v. 3)[166] has been fused with the style characteristic of disputation. Thus we have a disputation which ends with the promise that Yahweh has already turned to comfort and to bring about a new paradise. This fusion of the two types of speech is undoubtedly to be attributed to Deutero-Isaiah. We have noted his tendency to appeal to the past as a point of agreement in order to secure agreement about a statement concerning the present and future.[167] Thus if this style is uniquely Deutero-Isaianic, we must raise the question as to how the search for Gattungen can help us to determine the extent of units in this particular chapter.

---

[164] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 43.

[165] von Waldow, op. cit., p. 36.

[166] V. 3a contains the perfect tense, which is often used to express the fact that Yahweh has turned to intervene.

[167] Cf. 41:1-7, 21-29; 43:8-13; 46:5-11; 45:9-13.

We have observed many times over that Deutero-Isaiah is not usually completely independent of the influence of traditional speech-forms. Even when his speeches of salvation have been fused with disputation speech, as in 49:14ff., we have seen that the text is divisible into formal units. So now, turning to 51:4ff., we begin by suggesting that v. 4a might be construed as a new beginning, with vv. 4b-5 as the announcement of salvation proper. The fact that the subject matter of vv. 4-5 and vv. 1-3 is different gives additional support to the separation between vv. 3 and 4. Vv. 1-3 constitute a promise of paradise to Zion in the form of a disputation. In vv. 4-5, by contrast, the promise has to do with Yahweh's tōrā in the judgment of the nations. Even though it is not clear whether we should here interpret the nations' waiting for Yahweh's judgment as something positive for them (as in 42:4)[168] or whether they wait only as instruments of Yahweh's deliverance of Israel (as in 60:9), it is almost certain that vv. 4-7 are not directly connected with vv. 1-3 by form or content.

Turning now to vv. 6-8, we discover that they can be separated form critically into two units. V. 6 constitutes one unit, introduced by the two imperatives and followed by the announcement of salvation in the clauses introduced by כי . Vv. 7-8 are also introduced by an imperative, followed by the exhortation, "Fear not!" and the announcement of salvation as a substantiating clause. Begrich, however, sees vv. 6-8 as one speech unit in two parts.[169] For him, the cultic salvation oracle imitated by Deutero-Isaiah contains two parts, as does the lament psalm. V. 6, however, is not an imitation of the cultic salvation-assurance oracle, so that Begrich's argument cannot be sustained. It is probably impossible to decide with assurance whether vv. 6 and 7-8 were originally uttered together. I incline toward the view that they were originally separate and that they were later joined together because of similarity in phraseology. I lean in this direction because they are each complete form critically. One imitates the cultic salvation-assurance oracle from the communal lament, (vv. 7-8), while the other shows no such roots. Moreover, each can be understood as a message unit without the other. Finally, we know that similar phrases could be uttered at different times in different contexts.[170] These arguments are by no means absolutely decisive, but the lack of positive reason to see an original connection suggests that they were originally separate. However that may be, the original separateness of vv. 6-8 from vv. 4-5 is probable. Not only are they not connected form critically, but also the content is different. The concern of vv. 6 and 7-8 is to contrast the disintegration of the world with the ישועה and צדקה of Yahweh. In vv. 4-5, by contrast, the emphasis is on Yahweh's tōrā and the judgment of the nations.

---

[168] Cf. also 45:20; 49:6.

---

[169] Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja*, pp. 5, 12.

[170] Cf. Ps. 96:13; 98:9.

To be sure, similarities exist among the various parts of vv. 1-8. They share in common the addressee in the second plural, and all have Yahweh as the speaker. All begin with imperatives. They all speak of Yahweh's deliverance of his people, and all but vv. 1-3 share the terms ישע and צדק . But the similarities are only stylistic and thematic. No clear progression in message prevents each one from having originally stood alone, since each can stand out from its context by the criteria of both form and content. It seems more likely that we have a collection of originally separate utterances, joined together because each begins with an imperative, because of similarity in theme and phraseology,[171] and because of catchword connections.[172] Vv. 1-8 form a collection based on these similarities, to be distinguished from the preceding and following contexts.

11. 51:9-16, 17-23; 52:1-2. Among form critics widely divergent opinions concerning the literary character of these verses have

---

[171] V. 6 with vv. 7-8.

[172] צדק , ישע (vv. 5, 6b, 8b); הביטו (vv. 1,2,6); תורה (vv. 4,7); רדפי צדק (v.1)/ ידעי צדק (v.7).

arisen. Koehler,[173] Mowinckel,[174] Begrich,[175] von Waldow,[176] and Fohrer[177] view these verses as a collection of separate speeches, though there is wide divergence among them in the delineation of units. Others, however, such as Haller[178] and Volz,[179] consider these verses to be an original unity, though the limits of the unit are not the same for both. More recently, Westermann has argued for the original unity of these verses as a long poem made up of imitations of several Gattungen.[180] As a result of the lack of agreement, the form critical work must be done again.

Turning first to vv. 9-11, we find that it can be isolated form critically as a part of a communal lament. V. 9a is the introductory cry for help.[181] Vv. 9b-10 constitute the motivation for Yahweh's help by appealing to his deeds in the past.[182] At this point difficulties arise. Begrich and von Waldow[183] consider v. 11 to be the petition (Bitte) of the lament psalm, expressed in the form of a wish. Westermann, on the other hand, suggests that v. 11 is a promise, as it is in 35:10. In his opinion, this is a sign that Deutero-Isaiah has modified the form of the lament psalm.[184] The position of Begrich and von Waldow cannot be sustained on grammatical grounds. ובאו and נסו[185] cannot be read as jussives. The position of Westermann is possible grammatically, and a comparison with 35:10 gives it added weight. Nevertheless, I would offer another alternative. V. 11, it seems to me, can be read as a continuation of the motivation begun in v. 9b. The participles in vv. 9b-10, apparently to be translated as an action not limited to one point of time in the past, are carried on by verbs which denote incompleted action.[186] If this view is correct, the lament psalm fragment contained in vv. 9-11 ends with the motivation. Whether or not my suggestion is correct, it is clear that vv. 9-11 can be separated from the context by form. V. 12 begins a new, though related, form.

---

[173] Koehler, op. cit., p. 108.

[174] Mowinckel, op. cit., pp. 108, 109.

[175] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 5.

[176] von Waldow, op. cit., pp. 21-25.

[177] Fohrer, op. cit., pp. 145ff.

[178] Haller, op. cit., pp. 60ff.

[179] Paul Volz, Jesaja II uebersetzt und erklaert, KAT 9 (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932), pp. 116ff.

[180] Westermann, "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," pp. 368-369; Sprache und Struktur, pp. 121-122; Das Buch Jesaja, pp. 192ff.

---

[181] Cf. e.g., Ps. 80:3.

[182] Cf. e.g., Ps. 74:12-17.

[183] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 167-168; von Waldow, op. cit., p. 23.

[184] Westermann, "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," p. 369; Sprache und Struktur, p. 122; Das Buch Jesaja, p. 196.

[185] Or ונס, if 1QIsa is correct.

Vv. 12-16 can be isolated form critically as a salvation speech, derived from the cultic answer to the lament psalm. It begins with Yahweh's introduction of himself as the people's comforter, followed by a long rhetorical question concerning the people's fear (vv. 12-13). This is a disputational question derived from the exhortation, "Fear not!" The promise in v. 14 is the conclusion to the disputation, and v. 15 is the concluding substantiation for vv. 12-14. The disputation style is a typical Deutero-Isaianic transformation of a cultic speech-form adapted freely to meet the circumstances of doubt in the exile. Certain literary problems present themselves. Vv. 12-15 apparently once existed without v. 16.[187] In addition the constant shifting from second masculine plural to second feminine singular to second masculine singular is perplexing. Von Waldow is probably correct that this speech is an answer to a communal lament directed toward a community which conceives itself as Zion.[188] This would explain both the second masculine plural and the second feminine singular, and the second masculine singular would be either the Hebrew tendency to use second masculine for second feminine or the tendency to alternate plural and singular. At any rate, it is clear that vv. 12-16, even though v. 16 is surely a later addition, can be isolated from the surrounding context as Deutero-Isaiah's imitation of a salvation oracle.

---

[186] The verbs in the imperfect may be regarded as incompleted action in the past. Even if נסו is the correct text, the dominance of the other verbs would not allow us to read this verb as denoting action limited to one point of time in the past.

[187] V. 15 is a closing substantiation to vv. 12-14. Moreover, v. 16 seems to be directed to the prophet rather than the community.

Vv. 17-23 also constitute a formal unit. Begrich is probably correct that vv. 17-20 are derived from speech used to comfort mourners.[189] The use of קום in 2 Samuel 12:20 suggests that the verb might be employed in imperative form, along with other appropriate imperatives, as a speech to comfort mourners. The appearance of נוד in v. 19 gives added weight to the notion that this is a speech-form used to comfort mourners.[190] נחם in v. 19, whether read as first person or emended to third,[191] is also additional evidence for this view.[192] The language of vv. 17aβ -20 is derived from the complaint sections of the lament psalm. The word of comfort becomes a speech of salvation in vv. 21-23. It begins with the introductory call to hear (v. 21) and messenger formula (v. 22aα), followed by the statement that Yahweh has already turned to take away the cup (v. 22aβ) and an announcement of the consequences for Jerusalem and her enemies of his having taken away the cup (vv. 22b-23). This fusion of the style of the speech of comfort and the language of salvation speech is no doubt Deutero-Isaiah's creation, but it is clear that he has employed two speech-forms that can be distinguished from one another. Moreover, the fusion into one speech can be separated from the preceding salvation speech (vv. 12-16) by both form and content.

---

[188] von Waldow, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

[189] Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja*, p. 56.

[190] Cf. Na. 3:7.

[191] Cf. the commentaries.

[192] Cf. Gn. 37:35; 2 Sam. 10:3; Na. 3:7; Jb. 2:11, etc.

We now move to 52:1-2 in order to determine whether it is distinguishable form critically from its context. Unfortunately we do not have enough comparative material to be as precise as we would like in our form critical analysis. Even so, it is possible, I believe, to determine enough about the form to decide its relation to its context. Begrich views it as a Gattung whose speeches he calls kurze Anweisungen,[193] which are begun by imperatives and often continued by a clause introduced by כי.[194] He sees these as instructions given to inhabitants of a city. But this view is not satisfactory for 51:1-2. The imperatives are not directed to persons within the city, but rather to Zion itself as a holy city. Moreover, the content of the speech does not contain the kind of instructions that can be considered an imitation of the kind of speech seen in Genesis 19:15ff. Instead, the speech is more likely an imitation of a word of comfort. Zion is exhorted to arise from the dust.[195] The reference to putting on clean garments may be viewed as a reference to the end of the period of mourning.[196] So 52:1-2 sets itself off from the context as a word of comfort, exhorting Zion to put on new clothes for a glorious future without the defilement which produces the circumstances requiring mourning. The prose verses 3-6 cannot be a continuation of vv. 1-2, either by form or content. 52:1-2 can be distinguished from the preceding context in that both 52:1-2 and 51:17-23 are complete units form critically.

---

[193] Gn. 19:15ff.; Is. 48:20-21; 52:1-2, 11-12.

[194] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 50-51.

Having tried to show that 51:9-52:2 is composed of several units which can be isolated by form, I turn now to the question whether each of these units was originally uttered separately and only later joined together or whether we have a long poem in which several Gattungen are imitated. As we have seen above, Mowinckel, Begrich, and von Waldow opt for the former, while Westermann embraces the latter. For Westermann, the double imperatives (51:9,17; 52:2) and the repeated אנכי (51:12) are indications of a conscious poetic composition. Moreover, the composition reflects, in his view, a conscious imitation and interweaving of the communal lament and the salvation-assurance with the announcement of salvation.[197] 51:9-10 is the communal lament. 51:12-13 contains the salvation-assurance, with the nominal substantiating clause found in v. 15a and the perfect-tense substantiation in v. 22. The elaboration of the future--i.e., the announcement of salvation--appears in full strength in 52:1-2.

---

[195] Note the appearance of קום as an imperative, and compare my discussion above.

[196] Cf. 2 Sam. 12:20; Est. 5:1.

Such an imitation of various forms while at the same time distributing the various parts of the lament psalm and its answer over the total composition is difficult to imagine as a means of writing poetry. The elements accounted for by Westermann's "distribution theory" can better be accounted for by looking at each element in terms of its own formal unit. For example, 51:22 is not the substantiation for the exhortation, "Fear not!" lying behind v. 12. In fact, it is not a substantiating clause at all. It is a simple announcement of Yahweh's intervention. Moreover, its content is closely bound up with the imagery of the כוס התרעלה, which dominates vv. 17-23 and is in no way related to the fear of the "fury of the oppressor" of vv. 12-15.

---

[197] Westermann, *Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 194.

It is more fruitful, I believe, to follow Mowinckel's lead by viewing 51:9-52:2 as a group of separate speeches collected together on the basis of catchword and content. The lament with its answering salvation speech (vv. 9-16)[198] was joined with vv. 17-23 and 52: 1-2 because of the doubled imperatives of the verb עור, as well as the imperatives of קום (51:17, 52:2) and לבש (51:9; 52:1) and the repetition of עז (51:9; 52:1). Moreover, all three speech-units address Zion-Jerusalem. 51:17-23 and 52:1-2 are both a word of comfort to the distressed city. These connecting features indicate that the arrangement of the material is not accidental, but the fact that each can be separated form critically, as well as in terms of imagery, suggests that they were originally uttered separately and later joined together.

12. Chapters 54-55. Form critics are generally agreed that these two chapters can be divided into several units, but there is wide

---

[198] Although vv. 9-11 can be distinguished form critically from vv. 12-16, their liturgical association suggests that they originally stood together. It is possible, however, that they were originally separate and were placed together because of the stylistic similarity of the double imperative and the doubled first person pronoun.

divergence in the delineation of these units.[199] Thus a fresh look is needed.

In 54:1-3 the form is as follows: The speech begins with a hymnic introduction (v. 1abα), followed by a substantiating clause introduced by כי (v. 1bβ). The substantiating clause is a modification of hymnic style in that it is a promise uttered by Yahweh rather than the usual hymnic recital of Yahweh's past deeds or a catalogue of the general acts of mercy which Yahweh always performs. The imperative style is picked up again in v. 2. This time it does not appear in hymnic style but as a command to the barren woman to enlarge her dwelling. This is followed by another substantiating clause introduced by כי, again in the form of a promise. This combination of hymnic style with the style of the promise of salvation is Deutero-Isaianic. There is no Sitz im Leben for such a fusion outside Deutero-Isaiah.

54:4-6 shifts to the form of the salvation-assurance oracle, as אל תיראי shows. Deutero-Isaiah modifies the form, however.

---

[199] Gressmann: 54:1-3, 4-8, 9-10, 11-17; 55:1-5, 6-7, 8-13. Mowinckel: 54:1-10, 11-17; 55:1-5, 6-13. Koehler: 54:1-6, 7-10, 11-14a, 14b-17; 55:1-5, 6-7, 8-11 (13). Begrich: 54:1-3, 4-6, 7-10, 11-17; 55:1-5, 6-7, 8-13 (cf. also von Waldow). Fohrer: 54:1-3, 4-6, 7-8, 9-10, 11-17; 55:1-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-11, 12-13. Westermann: 54:1-10, 11-17; 55:1-5, 6-11, 12-13. Cf. Gressmann, op. cit., p. 264; Mowinckel, op. cit., pp. 110-111; Koehler, op. cit., pp. 108-109; Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 5; Fohrer, op. cit., pp. 167ff.; Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja, pp. 217ff.

The appearance of the substantiating clauses in v. 4a in the imperfect seems to be a modification of the usual form, as well as the fact that Zion (or at least a female) is the addressee, though lack of numerous examples of the salvation-assurance oracle outside Deutero-Isaiah limits our knowledge of the original form. Other indications of modification are present also. Following the elaboration of Yahweh's intervention (v. 4b), the promise is substantiated by a rather lengthy group of participial sentences. Following this are a set of clauses introduced by כי which speak of the wife's past (and present) plight (v. 6), a past which is a notable contrast to the future. Clauses like this at the end of a unit are unusual in salvation speeches in general and are unknown to us in salvation-assurance oracles.[200] This is no doubt a sign that vv. 4-6 reflect an *imitation* of the normally-cultic salvation-assurance oracle. Deutero-Isaiah, having already distinguished sharply between the present and the future in v. 4b, heightens the contrast by adding v. 6, and in so doing, modifies the form. This heightening of the contrast between present and future is related to the depth of the despair occasioned by the exile. Such a cleavage between the present and the future is found elsewhere in Deutero-Isaiah.[201]

---

[200] In fact, the phenomenon is so rare that one might be tempted to place v. 6 with vv. 7-10. But v. 6 continues the imagery of the forsaken wife, and that imagery is not present in vv. 7-10.

[201] Cf. 43:16-21.

Even though they are simply an imitation of a cultic *Gattung*, vv. 4-6 stand out from their context. To be sure, Westermann argues that vv. 1-3 and 4-6 stand together as parts of a longer poetic composition. The doubled imperatives in v. 1, in his opinion, correspond to the doubled exhortations in v. 4. The substantiating clauses in vv. 1b, 2, 3 correspond to those in vv. 4-6. But there are three imperatives in both v. 1 and v. 2 in contrast with two exhortations in vv. 4-6. Moreover, vv. 1-3 reflect the imagery of the barrenness of the present time over against the many children of the future, while vv. 4-6 have to do with the theme of the wife forsaken by her husband.

Vv. 7-10 shift from the language about the wife to the language of covenant, as the term ברית shows (v. 10). This text separates itself from the context as a disputation-like announcement of salvation, in which the promise is made more credible by an appeal to what is known of the relationship between Yahweh's anger and grace in the time of Noah. This disputation-like promise has two parts (vv. 7, 8). Each part opens with a statement that for a brief time Yahweh has turned away from Zion (vv. 7a, 8aα). The preposition ב is at the beginning of each. The clause expressing Yahweh's temporary abandonment of Zion is followed by another in similar style expressing the contrast of a promising future (vv. 7b, 8aβb). Then the promises are substantiated by an appeal to past history. Just as Yahweh swore to end his anger in the time of Noah, so now his ברית and חסד can be counted on as sure. This structure differs from the imitation of the salvation-assurance in vv. 4-6. The form of vv. 7-10, which arises out of the attempt to counter the complaint that Yahweh has forsaken Zion, differs from the simple announcement of salvation beginning in v. 11. Thus vv. 7-10 are a formal unit. Apparently the form of vv. 7-10 is attributable to Deutero-Isaiah himself. We find this structure nowhere else, and we know from other examples of Deutero-Isaiah's tendency to fuse disputation style with the language of salvation that this fusion has its Sitz im Leben in Deutero-Isaiah's preaching in the circumstances of the exile.

Vv. 11-17 present particular problems. Most scholars view these verses as a unit. They begin with a direct address (v. 11a) and announcement of salvation introduced by הנה in typical style (v. 11b).[202] They end with an impersonal summary statement, which is often used at the end of units in the Isaianic tradition.[203] Koehler, however, separates them into two units: vv. 11-14a and vv. 14b-17.[204] He does not explain why he views them as two separate units, although one suspects that his division is on the basis of content. Indeed, the fact that these verses promise riches at the beginning as opposed to freedom from oppression and injustice at the end suggests the possibility that two speeches have been juxtaposed. But if that is the case, where would the separation between them be made? Between vv. 13 and 14? Or between vv. 14a and 14b?[205] We cannot be sure where the division lies, but we are able to note certain elements which serve as connectors of two probably originally separate speeches. Both parts have הנה אנכי (vv. 11,16). If v. 14a belongs to the first part, as poetic parallelism suggests, the catchword צדקה is a unifying factor (vv. 14, 17). In both, of course, the addressee is second feminine singular. In any event, vv. 11-17 can be distinguished from the context by the formal markers described above. Furthermore, there are no direct content connections with the surrounding context. We have already seen the discontinuities with vv. 7-10. A shift to a promise on the theme of the Davidic covenant in 55:1-5 separates 54:11-17 from the following context.

---

[202] Cf. 41:11, 15; 43:19; 49:22.

[203] 14:26; 17:14. Cf. also 42:16, in which the summary statement has been modified so that Yahweh is the subject of the clause.

[204] Koehler, op. cit., p. 108.

55:1-5 begins a new unit. The change from feminine singular to masculine plural is one indication of the new unit. But 55:1-5 also stands out from its context by form. Begrich views it as a Gattung from Wisdom circles--the invitation to a meal.[206] Not only does the subject-matter of life[207] and eating and drinking[208] have firm roots in Wisdom, but also the form. The invitation, marked by the imperatives in vv. 1b and 3, is paralleled in Wisdom texts (Pr. 9:5; Sir. 24:19). This speech is an imitation of this particular Wisdom Gattung, says Begrich, as the content and form of vv. 3b-5 show. The content is not the same as Wisdom; a modified expression of the traditions of the Davidic covenant is substituted for the normal content appearing in Wisdom circles. The form of vv. 3b-5, moreover, is that of a salvation speech. Von Waldow differs from Begrich by viewing these verses as an imitation of the speech of a street merchant, who calls for people to come and buy what he has to sell.[209] Even the summons to come and buy without money is imaginable as the language of such a merchant.

---

[205] Rearrangements of the text are arbitrary and unconvincing. Cf. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 12, and Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja, pp. 222-223.

[206] Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, pp. 52-54.

Von Waldow is probably correct that the form is the speech of a street merchant. The invitation is to buy, in apparent contrast with Proverbs 9:4ff. and Sirach 24:19ff. Nevertheless, the language of Wisdom is evident. Not only does the summons to receive life seem to be drawn from Wisdom, but also the imperative הטו אזנכם is a formula at home in Wisdom circles.[210] Did Wisdom circles have a

---

[207] Cf. Pr. 3:13-18; 4:22; 8:35; 9:6ff.; Sir. 4:12.

[208] Pr. 9:2, 5; Sir. 1:17; 15:3; 24:19, 21.

[209] von Waldow, op. cit., p. 22.

[210] Cf. Pr. 4:20; 5:1; 22:17; Ps. 78:1.

Gattung imitating the cry of a street merchant from which Deutero-Isaiah drew? Or did Deutero-Isaiah fuse the language of the street merchant with that of Wisdom? We cannot be sure. We can be certain, however, that the fusion of the speech of the street merchant with the promise in vv. 3b-5 is Deutero-Isaiah's own work. Thus vv. 1-5 separate themselves from their context as the speech of a street merchant, whose summons to hear in v. 3 is followed by a salvation speech.

Form critical study of vv. 6-13 has led to different results as to the number of units and their nature.[211] Thus a new attempt is necessary. Vv. 6-7 constitute a prophetic imitation of priestly tôrā.[212] These verses begin with imperatives in the second person plural to "seek Yahweh" and to "call upon him" (v. 6), followed by jussives (v. 7).[213] Here, as elsewhere in prophetic literature,[214] the utterance is a word of the prophet rather than a word of Yahweh.

In vv. 8ff., Yahweh becomes the speaker. Does this mean that we have a new speech unit, as Begrich and others claim? The close association of דרך and מחשבה in vv. 8-9 indicates that these two verses were not originally completely unrelated to vv. 6-7. They appear to be a speech for the purpose of disputing the doubt that Yahweh will forgive. He will forgive, Deutero-Isaiah has Yahweh argue, because his ways and thoughts are different from those of man. Whether vv. 6-7 and 8-9 were originally uttered at the same time or whether vv. 8-9 were uttered later as an addition to vv. 6-7 is not clear. It does seem likely, however, that vv. 8-9 are a disputational reflection on vv. 6-7.

---

[211] Cf. above, footnote 198.

[212] Cf. Begrich, Studien zu Deuterojesaja, p. 51.

[213] For this style elsewhere in prophetic literature, cf. Am. 5:4, 5, 6, 23; Is. 1:13, 16, 17. Cf. Begrich, "Die priesterliche Tora," BZAW 66 (Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann, 1936), p. 73.

[214] Cf. e.g., Am. 5:6.

In vv. 10ff. the subject matter changes. No longer do we deal with the question of forgiveness or the ways and thoughts of Yahweh and man, but rather the reliability of Yahweh's word. Moreover, the text presents no transition from one subject to the next. A stylistic point of contact with vv. 8-9 is apparent, however. Vv. 10-11 are a disputation with a structure similar to vv. 8-9, in which a clause introduced by כן (vv. 9b,11) is the conclusion made on the basis of a preceding comparison (vv. 9a,10). Vv. 10-11 do not seem to continue the thought of the preceding verses, however, even though the introductory כי appears to connect them.[215]

Vv. 12-13 present a similar problem. In form, these two verses are an announcement of salvation. The people are promised that they will go out from Babylon in rejoicing (v.12a), and this announcement is extended by the promise that creation will participate in that rejoicing (v. 12b) and that creation will be renewed (v. 13a). The salvation speech is closed by a statement of the purpose of Yahweh's action (v. 13b). These two verses separate themselves from their context not only by form, however, but also by content. It is difficult to find a direct connection in thought with the preceding context. Nevertheless, vv. 12-13 seem to be connected with the preceding context by the introductory כי .

---

[215] Westermann's theory that vv. 8-9 and 10-11 imitate the two parts of the psalm of praise (God's majesty/God's goodness) is strained. Das Buch Jesaja, p. 230.

It is unlikely that the question of original unity or secondary juxtaposition can be settled definitively with regard to vv. 6-13. I believe, however, that it is possible to indicate a meaningful continuity for vv. 6-13, whether the continuity is original or provided by a collector. Vv. 6-7 summon the people to seek Yahweh, who is merciful and forgiving. Vv. 8-9 attempt to overcome objections by arguing that the ways of Yahweh and man are very different. Vv. 10-11, employing a similar form, argue the reliability of Yahweh's word. Vv. 12-13 announce the exodus of the people and the new creation. If vv. 6-13--the end of the Deutero-Isaianic corpus--are compared with the beginning of the collection in Chapter 40, we notice certain similarities. The theme of forgiveness in 55:6-7 corresponds with the theme of acceptance of sins in 40:1-2. The theme of the exodus from captivity in 55:12-13 is also present in 40:3-5. The notion of the radical difference between Yahweh and man in 55:8-9 and the theme of the reliability of Yahweh's word in 55:10-11--here unconnected except by similarity in formal structure and by a connecting כי -- are present in 40:6-8. These correspondences are hardly accidental, thus giving credibility to my thesis that 55:6-13 is a carefully planned kerygmatic unit. The fact that the various parts are joined by כי is additional evidence. To be sure, 55:6-13 and 40:1ff. do not correspond at every point. This is probably the case because the Deutero-Isaianic corpus is the work of a collector who could only approximate correspondences. Nevertheless, the similarities are striking and hardly accidental.

In summary, we have concluded that chapters 54-55 are a collection of separate speeches, distinguishable both by form and content. Even so, certain connections are apparent. Chapter 54 contains the second feminine singular address throughout. Moreover, as Mowinckel has seen, there are catchword, stylistic, and thematic connections.[216] 54: 1-3 and vv. 4-6 contain not only the catchword בעל (vv. 1, 5), but also the theme of the married woman.[217] In addition there are stylistic similarities. לא ילדה and לא חלה (v.1) compare with לא תבושי and לא תחפירי (v.4). The promises in vv. 1bβ and 4b are introduced by כי . These are of course stylistic, not formal, similarities. The catchword עזב connects vv. 7-10 with the preceding context, as well as the theme of the present need contrasted with the glorious future. In vv. 11-17 the phrase לא, תיראי (v. 14) connects this verse with the context (cf. v. 4). Mowinckel[218] notes the stylistic similarity of v. 11a with v. 1abα , as well as the catchword שלם (vv. 10, 13). 55: 1-5 picks up the catchword ברית (v. 3) from the previous context (54:10) as well as the word חסד (54:8, 10; 55:3). 55: 6-13 picks up the imperatives of the previous context, as Mowinckel notes.[219] Of the various connections the covenant theme is the most prominent as an organizing principle. As we have just seen, it appears explicitly in 54: 7-10 and 55: 1-5. But one suspects that the reference to the "eternal sign that will not be cut off" (55:13) is not accidental in the context of chapters 54-55. In 55:3 the text speaks of "cutting" (כרת) and "eternal covenant." This indicates, in my opinion, that 55: 13b was placed in the context of chapters 54-55 by the collector to be understood as a reference to the idea of covenant.

---

[216] Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, pp. 110-112.

[217] We have seen above the differences between vv. 1-3 and 4-6 in their reflections on the married woman.

Our research has indicated that the collector of chapters 54-55 employed a variety of means to associate the units with one another.

---

[218] Mowinckel, op. cit., p. 110.

[219] Ibid., p. 112.

The dominant connector is the covenant theme, and it is so prominent that it appears to be a theological principle of organization instead of a purely mechanical means of association. Nevertheless, chapters 54-55 are but loosely organized under the covenant heading. Not all of the texts explicitly reflect the covenant idea, and the other mechanical means of association discussed above rule out progression in thought throughout both chapters. At the same time the dominance of the covenant theme indicates that the collector intended for chapters 54-55 in their present context to be read in relation to the covenant idea.

C. SUMMARY

I have attempted to argue in this chapter that the forms of Deutero-Isaiah's speeches of salvation are varied. He has employed two Gattungen from the cult with minor modifications--the salvation-assurance oracle and the oracle-form reflected in 41:17-20, 42:14-17, and Psalm 12:6. Most of his other salvation speeches betray more heavily his own stamp. This is particularly true of those speeches which are decidedly disputational in character.

The quality of disputation permeates Deutero-Isaiah's speeches of salvation, as well as his trial speeches and disputation speeches. In many cases, as we have seen, the language of disputation is fused with the language of salvation speech in one formal unit. This is particularly noticeable in 49:14ff. But even when Deutero-Isaiah employs the above-mentioned cultic Gattungen, he (or the collector) tends to include the function of disputation. The juxtaposition of trial or disputation speeches with salvation oracles accomplishes the same purpose of combining disputation and proclamation of salvation as does their fusion within one formal unit.

D. DEUTERO-ISAIAH AND FORM CRITICISM: CONCLUDING REMARKS

Our inquiry into the nature of the Deutero-Isaianic literature was prompted by the debate between those who saw these chapters as a collection of originally separate utterances and those who viewed them as a planned literary composition. In the three chapters dedicated to form critical analysis I have upheld the general view of the former group. In some instances Deutero-Isaiah's units are close imitations of Gattungen used in various settings in Israel.[220] In other cases, however, the prophet has created his own forms. Nevertheless, they betray a stereotyped structure which makes it possible to isolate them from their context.

These results, if correct, mean that the view of Deutero-Isaiah as a planned literary composition is inadequate and potentially misleading for the interpretation of the text. We have seen above how Muilenburg's "literary critical" approach has caused him to overlook tensions between units in chapter 41 and to read the context of the trial into texts which should not be understood from the background of the trial. It would be possible, if space permitted, to multiply examples from Muilenburg and others in which connections are read into the text.

---

[220] Cf. 41:8-13, 14-16; 43:1-7; 44:1-5; 41:17-20; 42:14-17.

Our research has resulted also in substantial disagreement with the approach of Westermann. I have attempted to demonstrate that his notion of long poems made up of a complex interweaving of elements of several speech-forms is not an accurate understanding of Deutero-Isaiah's method of composition. It is true, to be sure, that the prophet fused and transformed Gattungen, often to the extent that the structure is essentially Deutero-Isaiah's own creation. But the form remains stereotyped to the degree that it can be isolated from its context by form. Westermann's failure to recognize this state of affairs results, in my opinion, in the absence of an instrument of control at the most basic level--namely, the level of the formal unit.

Having argued that Deutero-Isaiah's utterances can be isolated by form, we are now faced with the question of the place of the individual units within the Deutero-Isaianic corpus. Is the arrangement of the units meaningful? Or must we look only to the individual unit for the message-context? It is to such questions that we must now address ourselves.

V. THE NATURE OF THE COLLECTOR'S WORK

Up to this point we have been concerned with the form critical analysis of individual Deutero-Isaianic speeches and the relationship of each speech to its immediate context. The conclusions we have reached regarding the nature and scope of literary units are a necessary ingredient in exploring the structure of the entire Deutero-Isaianic corpus. It would be impossible to penetrate the organization of the corpus without first ascertaining the nature and scope of the literary units. Only after the accomplishment of this task can one determine the relationship of units to one another.

In the foregoing discussion I have argued that, for the most part at least, Deutero-Isaiah is composed of individual units of tradition which can be isolated on the basis of form. Moreover, the examination of each speech in its immediate context has led us to believe that in most cases the unit is related to the surrounding material by later juxtaposition. Since this is the case, we must recognize that the Deutero-Isaianic corpus as a whole is the work of a collector who juxtaposed already-existing units of material in a particular order.

Having decided that Deutero-Isaiah's utterances have been arranged by a collector, we are now confronted with the question of that compiler's methods and aims. Why did he juxtapose the speeches in this particular order? Does the arrangement of units reflect an attempt on the part of the collector to provide a level of meaning beyond that originally expressed by the prophet in each separate utterance? Or is there no kerygmatic significance whatsoever in the arrangement of speeches?

It would have been fortunate indeed if the collector had employed redactional formulae to provide a clue as to the nature and extent of larger and smaller collections within the corpus. But he did not make his footprints so obvious; the speeches are simply juxtaposed. Therefore, we must find ways to discover for ourselves the criteria for the association of texts.

As we have already observed, reconstructions of the collector's work have already been attempted. Among those who view Deutero-Isaiah as a collection of originally separate texts, several scholars--Mowinckel, Elliger, and Westermann--have made significant contributions to the problem. Their views differ significantly, in particular as to whether the collector's work has kerygmatic significance. This fact alone prompts us to open the question anew. But our belief that the form critical work of these scholars has been somewhat inadequate makes a new inquiry even more necessary. My undertaking of such an inquiry at the end of the foregoing chapters means that the results of those chapters will serve as primary data for examining the collector's methods. At the same time, the views of Mowinckel, Elliger, Hessler, and Westermann regarding the collector's work should be tested in the light of my own conclusions regarding form and context.

A. ANALYSIS OF SCHOLARSHIP

Sigmund Mowinckel was the first form critic to undertake a systematic examination of the methods employed by the collector of the Deutero-Isaianic corpus.[1] As we have already seen, he viewed Deutero-Isaiah as a collection of originally separate speeches, each of which has been arranged according to its association with the unit which precedes it. In most cases the means of association is a catchword connection or similarity in introductory or closing formulae. In other instances similarity in subject matter is the basis for juxtaposition of units. Such a process of collection, because it involves a loose association based on considerations other than progression in thought, has no kerygmatic significance.

We noted earlier Elliger's spirited challenge of Mowinckel in his attempt to prove that Deutero-Isaiah's pupil Trito-Isaiah collected, reworked, and in some instances supplemented his master's work in such a way that one can perceive a progression of thought in the arrangement of units.[2] Although Elliger did not view the entire corpus as a continuous series of kerygmatic connections, he believed that continuity in thought among several originally separate units can be seen repeatedly throughout the collection.

---

[1] Mowinckel, "Die Komposition des deuterojesajanischen Buches," ZAW 49 (1931), pp. 87-112, 242-260.

[2] Elliger, Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhaeltnis zu Tritojesaja (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933), pp. 219-272.

Our research shows, if accurate, that neither Mowinckel nor Elliger has provided a key that will unlock all doors. In several cases our analysis supports Mowinckel's notion of non-kerygmatic connections. I have argued, for example, that 51:1-8 is a collection of units organized on the basis of catchword connections and similarity in theme and phraseology. The thought does not progress as one reads from unit to unit.[3] In other places, however, we have seen that the juxtaposition of speeches involves progression in thought. In 42:18-25, for instance, a new meaning emerges by the addition of 43:1-7. The punishment by fire in the former takes on new significance when one views it in the light of the latter.[4]

Until recent years the major options presented by form critics were the view of mechanical methods of association on the one hand and progression of thought on the other. Eva Hessler, however, introduced a new element into the discussion. Although she did not believe that Deutero-Isaiah is composed of originally separate units, she did argue that Gattungen can be isolated. In her opinion, the author imitated Gattungen and arranged them in such a way that we may perceive kerygmatic unity among them. But it is not a unity based on thought progression. The unity is found instead in the structure of the corpus, for the structure is an imitation of the form of a legal proceeding.[5]

---

[3] Cf. Chapter IV, pp. 200-205.

[4] Cf. Chapter IV, pp. 178-181.

Hessler's conclusion that the unity is found in its imitation of legal proceedings is not, however, the only hint that the arrangement of the Deutero-Isaianic speeches is kerygmatically significant. For her, one sign that chapters 40-55 exhibit a meaningful structure is her view that the form and content of 40:1-11 and 55:1-13 correspond closely. The similarity of these two sections indicates to her that they were positioned intentionally as prologue and epilogue for the chapters in between.[6] Furthermore, she notes that the first part of the corpus, which is dominated by references to Jacob-Israel, is separated by a hymn (40:20-21) from the second section, which speaks of Zion-Jerusalem.[7] Another hymn (44:23) further divides the corpus, separating the section concerning Israel as Yahweh's witnesses (chapters 41-44) from the part that follows (44:24-48:19).[8] In a similar way the large division consisting of chapters 49:55 is broken up by a hymn (52:7-10).[9] This structure appears to be the result of careful planning.

---

[5] Hessler, Gott der Schoepfer: Ein Beitrag zur Komposition und Theologie Deuterojesajas (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ernst Moritz Arndt-Universitaet at Greifswald, 1961), pp. 15-17, 28, 98-102, 107. In Hessler's view, the author imitated and transformed Gattungen from various realms of life, and he combined them according to the structure of the trial.

[6] Ibid., pp. 98, 102, 253ff.

[7] Ibid., p. 82.

[8] Ibid., p. 82.

Hessler's argument that this structure is the product of a self-conscious plan does not, however, prove whether connections between Gattungen are kerygmatic. Her notion that the author imitated the structure of the trial is her weightiest argument for message unity. After the prologue and the questions which follow it (40:12-31), Hessler sees the structure of the trial proceedings as the basis for juxtaposing speeches. First come the preliminaries to the trial (41:1-42:9).[10] This includes the challenge of opponents to come to trial (41:1ff., 21-29).[11] Then the trial proper takes place (42:10-48:22).[12] It begins with a hymn (42:10-13) and salvation oracle (42:14-17). Then comes the introduction of witnesses (42:18-43:21). After this the salvation of the remnant by Cyrus the anointed is announced (44:24-46:13), concluding with the legal decisions promulgated by the court (47:1-48:16).[13]

---

[9] Ibid., p. 83.

[10] Ibid., pp. 99, 254-259.

[11] Ibid., pp. 99, 254, 256-257.

[12] Ibid., pp. 99, 259ff.

[13] Ibid., pp. 99ff.

Although Hessler regards chapters 49-55 also as an imitation of legal proceedings, it is not important for us to illustrate further the details of the various parts of the trial in those chapters. Our concern is instead primarily with method, and Hessler has been chosen for analysis because she offers an alternative view of kerygmatic unity to the notion of thought progression. In her opinion, the connection between Gattungen is provided by the trial framework. It is not necessary for one speech to continue the thought of the one before it; it is necessary only that it follow as the next element in the trial process. This formal approach has certain advantages over the notion of progression of thought. In the case of the latter a gap in the thought process can be bridged only by the imagination of the hearer or reader. But for Hessler the trial framework provides the connection. In 42:18ff., for instance, the blindness of Israel is reviewed as the witnesses are introduced (42:18-25), followed by the promise of a new future in which the witnesses may take up their true task (43:1-7). Having been prepared for their work by exhortation and promise, the witnesses are now confronted by the gathered forum (43:8-13) and challenged to testify for Yahweh. Vv. 14-15 continue in this vein, serving as the content of the affirmation which the witnesses are supposed to make in Yahweh's behalf. Israel, however, does not make this testimony; the witnesses, unfortunately, have a fixation on the "former things" and lack conviction about Yahweh's saving activity in the future.

Therefore, vv. 16-21 are added to urge the witnesses to shift their attention from the "former things" to the new deeds which Yahweh is about to perform.[14] A close examination of this treatment of 42:18-43:21 reveals that none of the transitions between units indicated above are actually stated in the text. They need not be supplied by a bridge of pure imagination, however. In Hessler's view, one makes these transitions because the structure of the trial prompts him to do so.

Claus Westermann follows Hessler at many points. But Isaiah 40:55 is a collection of originally separate poems, in his view. As we have already seen, sometimes each poem represents one Gattung; in other cases we have long poetic compositions made up of a complex interweaving of several Gattungen. But these individual poetic pieces are arranged according to a plan. Westermann adopts Hessler's division of the collection into Jacob-Israel and Zion-Jerusalem sections, as well as the subdivision marked by 44:23.[15] For Westermann, however, the Servant Songs do not belong to the original collection. They were added later. That this is the case can be seen in part by the hymns of praise (Loblieder) at the end of three of them (42:10-13; 49:13; 51:3). Westermann views these hymns as responses to the preceding Servant

---

[14] Ibid., pp. 260-263.

[15] Westermann, Sprache und Struktur der Prophetie Deuterojesajas, in Forschung am alten Testament, Theologische Buecherei, Band 24 (Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1964), p. 161.

Songs, much as the hymns in 44:23, 48:20-21, and 52:9-10 respond to the preceding group of Deutero-Isaianic speeches.[16] Westermann's opinions concerning kerygmatic connections appear to be more limited than those of Hessler, however. Although he believes that message units sometimes embrace more than one formal unit, he does not speak of Deutero-Isaiah as a collection based on continuous kerygmatic connections throughout. For example, the section 41:1-44:23, composed mostly of salvation-assurance oracles in juxtaposition with trial and disputation speeches, is a collection based on similarity in theme and Gattung.[17] But Westermann does not speak of continuous kerygmatic connections in this section, nor does he see an unbroken progression by viewing 41:1-44:23 in its entirety as a trial.[18]

I am persuaded by the arguments of Hessler and Westermann that the structure of Deutero-Isaiah is the result of a conscious plan. It is surely not accidental that the first part of the collection addresses the people as Jacob-Israel, while the latter half is dominated by Zion-Jerusalem. Nor is it accidental that the pattern of juxtaposing trial or disputation speeches with speeches of salvation is localized in chapters 41-44. With the recognition of such patterns, however, we have not thereby automatically determined whether the plan consists of an unbroken series of kerygmatic ties or is merely an arrangement of material according to theme, catchword, style, and Gattung. Must we accept Hessler's notion of trial imagery throughout, or should we be guided by Westermann's more limited approach?

---

[16] Ibid., p. 163.

[17] Ibid., p. 164.

[18] At no point does Westermann mention such an organizing principle. Cf., for example, his description of the organization of the corpus in Das Buch Jesaja: Kapitel 40-66, ATD, Teilband 19 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966), p. 26.

Hessler's attempts to present a picture of an unbroken kerygma are in my opinion unsuccessful. The idea that the collection as a whole is a literary replica of a trial cannot be supported by the text. Although trial Gattungen make their appearance, as well as legal language in non-forensic Gattungen,[19] there is no reason why we should read Gattungen such as the cultic salvation-assurance oracle as a part of the trial. The collector provides no clue to direct us to do so, nor does the overall structure of the collection conform so closely to the patterns employed in the town gate that we are compelled to recognize the parallel.[20]

The more modest approach of Westermann is in my opinion more in accord with the true state of affairs. The results of our research in the foregoing chapters support Westermann's view that some connections are kerygmatic but that others are not. At the same time, Westermann's view is not entirely satisfactory, partly because his tendency to postulate long poetic compositions obscures the problem of relationships between texts. But even in circumstances in which Westermann has seen accurately a break signifying originally separate texts, he often leaves us in the dark as to whether the connection is kerygmatic.[21] Finally, Westermann's reasons for assuming that the Servant Songs were inserted after the original collection was made are somewhat short of convincing. It is not my intention to argue here that they were included originally in the collection; I think it is sufficient to point out that Westermann's contention that the hymnic responses 42:10-13 and 49:13 indicate later insertion is a two-edged sword. If it is true that 44:23, 48:20-21, and 52:9-10 are examples of such responses which mark off sections in the original collection, why must we conclude that a similar circumstance with regard to the Servant Songs is a sign that they were inserted after the original collection was made?

---

[19] Cf. e.g., 50:4ff., particularly vv. 7-9.

[20] For a discussion of the speech-forms used in the town gate, cf. H.J. Boecker, Redeformen des Rechtslebens im alten Testament, WMANT 14 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964).

Although Hessler and Westermann have made important observations about the major division points within the collection, it is apparent that a methodological inquiry concerning the collector's work, particularly with regard to the relationship of kerygmatic and nonkerygmatic connections is still lacking. Ideally, a systematic examination of each text would be undertaken to determine its precise relationship to the entire collection. Unfortunately, a complete analysis would necessitate dealing with the Servant Songs. The unsolved problems with regard to these songs are so great that we must not attempt to make judgments here about them. It is better, I believe, to accept this limitation than to rush headlong into conclusions based on insufficient analysis. Happily, it is possible to probe at selected points in the collection to determine which relationships are kerygmatic and which are not, and this is what will be undertaken below. Although we shall still lack a complete and systematic understanding of the work of the collector, these selected probes should give us insight into his methods in structuring the corpus of Deutero-Isaiah.

---

[21] For example, is 41:17-20 related kerygmatically to the preceding context? Westermann does not discuss the issue. Cf. Das Buch Jesaja, pp. 66-68.

B. SELECTED EXAMPLES OF THE COLLECTOR'S METHODS

1. The Framework

We shall turn first to texts which illumine the broad plan of the collector. As we have seen, Hessler and Westermann, and others as well, believe that 40:1-11 reflects the structure of the entire corpus in miniature and was employed intentionally as the prologue to the collection. In this connection both see vv. 1-11 as a kerygmatic unit. But others do not regard these verses as a unity. Gressmann,[22] Koehler,[23] Mowinckel,[24] Begrich,[25] and von Waldow[26] see four units--vv. 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-11.

Usually these verses, particularly vv. 1-8, have been regarded as a reflection of a prophetic commissioning. Westermann sees vv. 1-11 as a unified account of the call,[27] while Begrich believes that vv. 1-8 are composed of three separate pieces, each of which reflects an element of the experience of commissioning.[28] For Begrich, vv. 1-2 and 3-5 are words from divine beings to divine beings; vv. 6-8 reflect the voice of the prophet. Vv. 9-11 are an imitation of a command given to a messenger of good tidings and have nothing to do with the prophet's call.[29]

---

[22] "Die literarische Analyse Deuterojesajas," ZAW 34 (1914), p. 264.

[23] Deuterojesaja stilkritisch untersucht (Giessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1923), pp. 102-104, 106, 125.

[24] Mowinckel, op. cit., pp. 88-89.

[25] Studien zu Deuterojesaja, BWANT, 4 Folge, Heft 25 (77) (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938), p. 5.

[26] Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rheinischen Friedrich Wilhelms-Universitaet at Bonn, 1953), p. 50.

[27] Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja, pp. 29-41.

[28] Begrich, op. cit., p. 54.

It is true, in my opinion, that vv. 1-8 reflect the commissioning of the prophet. In spite of the fact that these verses are not cast in the customary first person narrative style, a particular kind of prophetic commissioning--the type which occurs in the heavenly council (Isaiah 6; 1 Kings 22)--can be seen.[30] In these texts the prophet is transported by vision into the realm of the heavenly council where Yahweh is seated on his throne in the presence of the members of the council (1 Kings 22:19; Isaiah 6:1-2). The prophet hears Yahweh ask by means of a question introduced by מי who will perform a certain task (1 Kings 22:20; Isaiah 6:8). There is a considerable degree of flexibility, to be sure, in the manifestation of this type of prophetic commissioning. In 1 Kings 22 Yahweh's question is posed to the members of the heavenly council; in Isaiah 6 it is directed to a more general audience so that Isaiah the man can respond. Isaiah 6 is stamped by the prophet's confession of guilt and the cleansing of his lips. In spite of these differences, however, it is clear that both narratives reflect the same type of prophetic commissioning.

Isaiah 40:1ff. is not a narrative like Isaiah 6 and 1 Kings 22.

---

[29] Ibid., pp. 51-52,

[30] For a discussion of this type of prophetic commissioning, cf. W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel, BK 13 (Neukirchen, Kreis Moers: Neukirchen Verlag, 1956-), pp. 16-21.

Nevertheless, it is based on the imagery of the commissioning of a prophet in the heavenly council. The plural imperatives in vv. 1-2 and 3-5 indicate that the prophet is not the addressee. One might be inclined to guess that these imperatives are directed to members of the heavenly council. This guess is transformed into probability by the realization that just as Isaiah of Jerusalem heard the "voice" of Yahweh "speaking" (קול plus the participle אומר), so Isaiah 40:3 reports that a "voice is calling" (קול קורא). In 40:6-8 the "voice" speaks to the prophet (קול אמר). Instead of a question introduced by מי we find the command, "Cry!" In response to this imperative the prophet objects, "What shall I cry? All flesh is grass...." Just as Isaiah of Jerusalem had responded with uncertainty to the message he was given to proclaim (6:11), so Deutero-Isaiah is taken aback by his commission. His problem, however, is not "how long" he must utter a terrifying message, but whether he can proclaim anything at all. In the exile the cultic affirmation that man is "grass" which withers[31] apparently became intensified to the degree that Deutero-Isaiah doubts that any human can proclaim a message of hope. His objection is met, however: "The grass withers, the flower fades, but the word of our God stands forever."

Up to this point (vv. 1-8) we surely have a kerygmatic unity. The transactions in the heavenly council (vv. 1-5) cannot be separated from the summons to the prophet (vv. 6-8), as our discussion above indicates. Now we must ask whether vv. 9-11 are a continuation of this kerygmatic unit. Begrich views vv. 9-11 as an imitation of instructions given to a messenger who bears news concerning a battle.[32] In my opinion, this view is correct. Although the content of the message draws on cultic language,[33] the form of the speech reflects instructions to a messenger. Not only is the addressee named as a messenger, but the imperatives indicate that the messenger is being told what to say. Moreover, the imagery is military. Yahweh will come in strength; he will bring his booty with him. Thus vv. 9-11 are not a continuation of the prophetic commissioning. It is likely, then, that vv. 1-8 and 9-11 were originally separate. Other considerations reinforce this view: the shift to the second feminine address (v. 9), the change from imagery of a highway in the wilderness as a revelation of Yahweh's glory and a manifestation of the efficacy of the divine word (vv. 1-8) to the imagery of Yahweh's rule in Zion as a shepherd-like king (vv. 9-11).

---

[31] Cf. Ps. 90:5; 103:15.

The collector's juxtaposition of vv. 1-8 and 9-11 is not accidental, however, nor is it fully explained by the catchword קול.[34]

---

[32] Begrich, op. cit., pp. 51-52.

[33] Vv. 10-11 betray the style and content of the hymn.

[34] Cf. Mowinckel, op. cit., p. 89.

Instead, as we shall see, it reflects the structure of the Deutero-Isaianic corpus in miniature. We have already made reference to the argument of Westermann that 40:12-48:21 and 49:14-52:12 are two major divisions of the collection. Each of these sections ends with a command to leave the city (48:20-21; 51:11-12), and each begins with a long section of disputation (40:12-31; 49:14-26).[35] In 40:12-48:21 the following is to be observed: the addressee in often Jacob-Israel, never Jerusalem or Zion (except for 45:14-17). The people are addressed in the second masculine singular or the second masculine plural. The theme of Yahweh as creator is dominant throughout, as well as the imagery of the exodus through the wilderness. In these chapters the theme of the reliability of Yahweh's word is pervasive. The speeches which speak of Cyrus as Yahweh's instrument are restricted to these chapters.

By contrast with 40:12-48:21, in 49:14-52:12 the second feminine singular of Zion-Jerusalem is dominant; Jacob-Israel never appears. There is no explicit naming of Yahweh as creator, nor is there any mention of Cyrus or attempt to answer doubt that Yahweh's word is efficacious. In 49:14-52:12 the imagery connected with the return home is usually about the restoration of the bereaved mother Jerusalem's children; the picture of the highway through the wilderness does not appear at all.

It is my contention that the collector placed 40:1-8 and vv. 9-11 together as an anticipation of the first two major sections of the collection. 40:1-8 corresponds with 40:12-48:21 in a number of ways. The most prominent is the imagery of the highway in the wilderness and the emphasis on the power of Yahweh's word. The theme of Yahweh's glory (40:5) appears in Deutero-Isaiah only in 40:12-48:21 (43:7; 48:11).[36] In both 40:1-2 and 40:12-48:21 (43:22-28; 44:22) the notion of Yahweh's forgiveness occurs, while 40:9-11 and 49:14-52:12 do not contain it at all. Moreover, as Westermann has noted, the salvation-assurance oracle appears only in 40:12-48:21[37] and the perfect-imperfect tense sequence of that speech-form is at the heart of 40:1-8.[38] The verbs in v. 2 are in the perfect tense, and they exhibit the general tone of the perfect-tense verbs of the salvation-assurance oracle. Just as that oracle form adds to the verbs in the perfect tense concrete promises expressed by verbs in the imperfect, so vv. 1-8 move from the general tone of the perfect-tense verbs in v. 2 to specific promises which employ verbs in the imperfect tense and its conversive equivalent (vv. 4-5). Finally, the disputation in 40:6-8, in which the "word of Yahweh" is the ray of hope over against doubt, corresponds to the disputation and trial speeches in 40:12-48:21, which also tend to focus on the reliability of Yahweh's word.[39]

---

[35] Westermann, Das Buch Jesaja, p. 26.

---

[36] Cf. also 42:12; 43:7, 20, and in the Servant Songs 42:8.

[37] In 51:7-8 and 54:4-6 the form is considerably modified. Cf. my discussion of these texts in Chapter IV.

[38] Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, p. 166.

The relationships between 40:9-11 and 49:14-52:12 can be seen immediately in that Zion-Jerusalem is dominant in both. Also the image of the bearer of tidings appears in both (52:7ff.), as well as that of the arm of Yahweh (51:5, 9; 52:10).

The correspondences of 40:1-8 with 40:12-48:21 and 40:9-11 with 49:14-52:12 surely are not accidental. They signify, it would seem, that the juxtaposition of 40:1-8 with vv. 9-11 was an intentional act on the part of the collector to provide an introduction to correspond with the structure of the collection. Although the connection between vv. 1-8 and 9-11 is not kerygmatic, the juxtaposition is intentional. But 40:1-11 introduces not only 40:12-48:21 and 49:14-52:12; 40:1-11 also introduces the entire Deutero-Isaianic collection. We have already observed the similarities between 40:1-8 and 55:6-13--40:1-2 with 55:6-7, 40:3-5 with 55:12-13, and 40:6-8 with 55:8-9, 10-11.[40] 55:6-13, although tied to chapters 54-55 by means of the covenant theme,[41] is closely related to Deutero-Isaiah as a whole. It contains the themes of forgiveness of sins

---

[39] Cf. 41:21-29; 43:8-13; 44:6-8; 45:18-21; 46:5-11; 48:12-15.

[40] Cf. Chapter IV, pp. 222-223.

[41] Chapter IV, pp. 224-225.

(vv. 6-7), exodus from captivity (vv. 12-13), the qualitative difference between Yahweh and man (vv. 8-9), and the reliability of Yahweh's word (vv. 10-11). The close parallels with Deutero-Isaiah as a whole and with 40:1-8 suggest that 40:1-11 and 55:6-13 serve as prologue and epilogue to the collection.[42] They embrace a collection composed of three major blocks--40:12-48:21, 49:14-52:12, and the collection of speeches organized around the covenant, chapters 54-55.[43]

2. The Means of Fleshing Out the Framework

Now that we have recognized the division of Deutero-Isaiah into three large blocks, we must ask how the units within each of them relate to each other. We have observed already that some connections are kerygmatic but that others are not. Now the question before us is whether any patterns are observable, and, if so, what is their significance. In asking these questions we cannot examine the entire corpus; instead, certain groups of texts will be selected as illustrative of the collector's work.

---

[42] I cannot here present detailed arguments for excluding chapters 56-66 from the original collection; a few short statements must instead suffice. Chapters 40-55 are set within the context of the deliverance and the return home which are yet to come. The framework of chapters 40-55 provides the basis for organizing these chapters along these lines. Chapters 56-66, however, contain texts which do not concern themselves with the hope of the end of the exile. Chapters 56-59, for example, could well have originated after the return from exile. Moreover, Deutero-Isaianic phrases, such as 58:8b and 59:1 (and others as well), have been recast to speak to circumstances other than the hope that the captivity was at an end. On this last point, see W. Zimmerli, "Zur Sprache Tritojesajas," Festschrift fuer Ludwig Koehler (Bern: Buechler und Co., 1950), pp. 62-74.

[43] I have, of course, left the Servant Songs out of consideration.

a. 40:12-48:21. Turning first to 40:12-48:21, we can observe certain relationships. This block begins with a long kerygmatic disputation unit (40:12-31), which attempts to persuade doubters that Yahweh both can (vv. 12-26) and will (vv. 27-31) save. Between this disputation and the break in the collection marked by the hymn 44:23 we find mostly disputation speeches, trial speeches, and speeches of salvation. Indeed, a pattern of alternation is observable between the speeches which present arguments, i.e., the trial and disputation speeches, and those which announce salvation.[44] Following the hymn 44:23 we have a collection of speeches which mention Cyrus by name and revolve around his "anointment" by Yahweh as the instrument of Israel's deliverance (44:24-45:13). Then emerges a group of units which, broadly speaking, reflect the anticipation of the defeat of Babylon (45:14-47:16), followed by disputations (48:1-11, 12-15, 16), a wistful reflection on the bright but bungled opportunities held out to Israel (48:17-19), and a climactic command to leave Babylon (48:20-21).

A closer examination of the speeches in 41:1-44:23 reveals a pattern in the above-mentioned alternation of trial or disputation speeches and speeches of salvation. In several instances we have already observed a continuity between a given trial or disputation speech and the following salvation speech or group of salvation speeches.[45] There are a sufficient number of these instances to justify the conclusion that the collector has organized 41:1-44:23 largely on the basis of placing trial or disputation speeches before salvation speeches. Now we must ask whether the connection between the trial or disputation speech and the salvation speech(es) is always kerygmatic. In most cases we have observed a continuity in the message.[46] But in 43:8-21, I have argued, the connections between vv. 8-13, 14-15, and 16-21 are not kerygmatic but rather on the basis of catchword and theme.[47] We must conclude, therefore, that, although the pattern of trial or disputation speech followed by salvation speech is an organizing principle for 41:1-44:23, the connections between the speeches are not in each instance kerygmatic.

---

[44] Cf. 41:1-7 with vv. 8-13, 14-16, 17-20; 42:18-25 with 43:1-7; 43:8-13 with vv. 14-15, 16-21; 43:22-28 with 44:1-5.

If the collector did not juxtapose salvation speeches and trial or disputation speeches always on the basis of continuity in message, we may ask why he adopted the pattern at all. Perhaps 44:6-8 provides a clue. In this speech the collector found an utterance in which disputation and promise of salvation were joined in one formal unit.[48] Although the elements of disputation and promise are intertwined, the speech begins with the style of disputation (vv. 6-7) with the words of salvation toward the end (v. 8). It looks as if the collector used the pattern found in this speech as the basis for juxtaposing speeches in 41:1-44:23. In some cases he was able to join salvation speeches with trial or disputation speeches in such a way that continuity in message resulted. But he was not always able to mold his material into kerygmatic unity, as 43:8-21 shows.[49] But even here the thematic similarity expressed by the חדשות - ראשנות contrast provides for a very close relationship among the texts in 43:8-21, particularly between vv. 8-13 and 16-21.

---

[45] 41:1-7 with vv. 8-13, 14-16, 17-20; 42:18-25 with 43:1-7; 43:22-28 with 44:1-5. Cf. my discussion of these texts in Chapter IV.

[46] This is particularly true in the case of 42:18-25 with 43:1-7 and 43:22-28 with 44:1-5. But it is true in a certain sense with the speeches in 41:1-20, as I argued in Chapter IV. All of these speeches are to be read in their present context in the light of Yahweh's activity as creator.

[47] Chapter IV, pp. 185-187.

In contrast with the close ties between the salvation speech(es) and the preceding trial or disputation speech, we may observe that the relationship of that yoked pair to its surrounding context is usually rather loose. 41:1-20[50] is related to the verses preceding it only by the catchword phrase יחליפו כח (40:31; 41:1). 41:1-20 is also loosely related to the following context by the catchword קרב

---

[48] Cf. Chapter III, pp. 117, 124ff.

[49] Chapter IV, pp. 185-187.

[50] Cf. Chapter IV, pp. 165-171.

(41:1, 21), as well as by the theme of the "former" and "latter" things or "things to come" (41:4, 22).[51] 42:18-43:7 is related to the preceding verses only by the catchword עורים (42:16, 18, 19) and in similar fashion to the following context by עור (42:18, 19; 43:8) and חרשים (42:18, 19; 43:8).[52] 43:22-44:5 exhibits no particular relationship with 44:6-8.[53] Only in the connections between 43:8-21 and 44:22-44:5 do we find a close tie between speeches outside the yoked pair itself. Here we apparently have a kerygmatic connection; the people whom Yahweh made to praise him (43:21) have not called on him (v. 22). The conjunction joining vv. 21 and 22 is an additional suggestion that the collector intended to show a continuity in message.

We may conclude, then, that 41:1-44:23 is dominated by groups of yoked salvation speeches and trial or disputation speeches. They are usually, but not always, related kerygmatically. In most cases the relation of each of these complexes of closely associated speeches to the rest of the context is extremely loose; yet there is one instance in which the connection is kerygmatic. The fact that there are variations is probably due to the fact that the collector was limited by the material at his disposal.

---

[51] Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

[52] Cf. Chapter IV, pp. 180-181.

[53] Cf. Chapter III, p. 126.

Turning now to 44:24ff., we find that the pattern of trial or disputation speech followed by speeches of salvation has disappeared. This section begins instead with three speeches concerning Cyrus (44:24-28; 45:1-7, 9-13). I have already argued that 44:24-28 and 45:1-7 are not related kerygmatically.[54] The nature of the ties between 45:9-13 and the rest of the Cyrus complex, so we observed, is not as clear.[55] Nevertheless, they betray a kinship--in addition to catchword connections--that they all focus on the choosing of Cyrus.[56] They differ from the trial speeches in 41:1-44:23 which speak indirectly of Cyrus. These trial speeches attempt to dislodge the suspicion that Yahweh may be inferior to the gods. In 44:24-45:13 no such debate is reflected. Even in 44:24-28, in which general doubt about Israel's salvation is the chief problem, there is no concern about the power of the gods as in 41:1-7, 21-29, 43:8-13, and 44:6-8. Thus 44:24-45:13 is a collection of speeches which were juxtaposed because they speak of Yahweh's choosing Cyrus.

Following the Cyrus complex we have a group of speeches which speak of the nations as subservient to Yahweh (45:14-17, 18-25). These speeches, I have argued, were not originally uttered together,[57] but they have a thematic unity, indeed, even a rough kind of kerygmatic unity.[58] But why, we may ask, did the collector place this complex immediately after 44:24-45:13? Mowinckel's suggestion that vv. 14-17 are placed here because they are an address to Cyrus is surely incorrect;[59] there is no substantial reason for changing the feminine suffixes to masculine as he does. A more probable reason, I think, for placing vv. 14ff. at this spot is that vv. 14-17 read in this context would appear to be an elaboration on the release of the exiles mentioned in v. 13. This connection is not a tight message-continuity, and in the strict sense, should not be labeled kerygmatic. At the same time, it is probable that the collector saw an opportunity to describe what the return of the exiles under Cyrus would be like.

---

[54] Chapter II, p. 59.

[55] Chapter II, pp. 60-61.

[56] Cf. Chapter II, p. 53.

Having attempted to explain the relationships between the complexes 44:24-45:13 and 45:14-25, we now turn to chapter 46. Earlier we observed that the chapter is composed of vv. 1-4 and the kerygmatic unit vv. 5-13.[60] These two texts are related, as we saw, by the catchwords סבל (vv. 4, 7) and נשא (vv. 1, 3, 4, 7), which are expressive of their common theme of carrying idols; no progression in the message is apparent. But why does 46:1-13 follow chapter 45? The catchword כרע (45:23; 46:1) stands out immediately. Moreover, the impotence of the gods and the power of Yahweh is a dominant theme in both 45:18-25 and 46:1ff. Nor should we overlook the fact that both speak of a "remnant"--in the one instance those from the nations who have "escaped" (45:20) and in the other the remnant of Israel (46:3).[61] Perhaps Westermann is correct that the stylistic similarity of imperatives is a factor in the juxtaposing of texts,[62] although I am not quite certain whether one should regard this as intentional.

---

[57] Chapter III, pp. 138-140.

[58] Chapter III, p. 140.

[59] Mowinckel, op. cit., p. 101.

[60] Cf. Chapter II, pp. 43-48.

In the light of these correspondences we must ask whether the connections between 45:18-25 and 46:1ff. are kerygmatic. The question can be answered, I think, in the negative. 45:18-25 is an exhortation to the nations to turn to Yahweh, who alone is able to save. He has uttered an irrevocable word that every knee shall bow before him. A major purpose of this exhortation to the nations is to demonstrate Yahweh's power and uniqueness. It is perhaps true that a subsidiary aim may have been to encourage Israelites to cease doubting Yahweh's power, but the weight of the text is on Yahweh's oath to force the homage of the entire world. 46:1-4, however, does not pick up the theme of Yahweh's intention that all peoples should worship him, nor does the theme of Yahweh's irrevocable word appear here. Instead, vv. 1-4 contrast Yahweh's ability to "carry" his people with the impotence of the Babylonian gods who must be carried. These differences between 45:18-25 and 46:1-4, particularly in the absence of a clear transition made between them, suggest that the relationship is not on the basis of continuity in message.

---

[61] Cf. Westermann, Sprache und Struktur, p. 154.

[62] Ibid., p. 153.

We have not exhausted the relations between units in 40:12-48:21, but we have gained insight, I think, regarding the collector's methods. We have observed different patterns of collection in various parts of this large block. In some instances we have seen that connections are kerygmatic and in other cases not. We have also learned that message continuity occurs only here and there. Indeed, we have been unable to find a systematic pattern of kerygmatic units. More often the juxtaposition of units is on the basis of a literary pattern or by means of catchword or theme.

b. 49:14-52:12. This block begins, as does 40:12-48:21, with a long kerygmatic unit which functions in part as a disputation (49:14-26).[63] This unit of disputation is founded on the cultic complaint that Yahweh has forsaken Zion (49:14). It is not accidental that 49:14-52:12 begins with a disputation on such a liturgical utterance, for the complaint is a major element in this block of the collection. 51:9-16 is the clearest illustration of it.[64] But lying behind 50:1-3 is also the complaint that Yahweh has divorced the mother and sold his children into slavery. The primary organizing principle of 49:14-52:12, however, is the theme of Zion-Jerusalem.

---

[63] Cf. Chapter IV, pp. 196-200.

49:14-52:12 is composed of several smaller collections. For example, 49:14-50:3 is made up of the kerygmatic unit 49:14-26 and 50:1-3. The connections between 49:14-26 and 50:1-3, as we have seen, are not kerygmatic, but rather thematic.[65] 51:1-8, as we have already observed, is also a group of speeches related to one another non-kerygmatically.[66] The connection is in the basis of style, catchword, and theme. The same is true of 51:9-52:2 (12).[67] Each of these three groups has a kind of unity which separates the group from the surrounding context. For 49:14-50:3 it is the imagery of the mother and her children;[68] for 51:1-8 it is the catchwords ישע and צדק, as well as certain similarities in theme and phraseology.[69]

---

[64] Cf. Chapter IV, pp. 206-209.

[65] Chapter III, pp. 95-98.

[66] Chapter IV, pp. 201-205.

[67] Chapter IV, pp. 211-213.

[68] Cf. Chapter III, pp. 95-98.

[69] Cf. Chapter IV, p. 205.

51:9-52:2 finds its unity in the imperatives of עור, לבש, and קום and the repetition of עז ; the presence of two speeches of comfort to the distressed city is also a unifying factor.[70]

The collector's methods in juxtaposing 51:1-8 and 51:9-52:2 are transparent. Both groups employ the imagery of Yahweh's arm (51:5, 9); both are shaped in part by the exhortation, "Fear not!" (51:7, 12-13); in both, Yahweh's creative power is contrasted with the power of mortal man (51:6, 12-13). These similarities indicate that the collection-groups 51:1-8 and 51:9-52:2 were not juxtaposed accidentally. At the same time, there is no hint of a transition which would prompt us to see a kerygmatic connection between the two groups.

The uncertainty about the Servant Songs prevents our relating the collection-group 49:14-50:3 to its context. The fact that we have analyzed only three major Gattungen form critically means that the closing verses of the block 49:14-52:12 cannot be assessed here with regard to the collector's methods.[71] Nevertheless, we have penetrated far enough, I believe, to see that kerygmatic connections are not a major factor in the organization of this block. Indeed, so far as we are able to see, 49:14-26 is the only kerygmatic unit.

c. Chapters 54-55. We observed above that these chapters are the third major block in the Deutero-Isaianic collection. These two chapters are unified loosely, as we have seen, by means of the covenant theme.[72] With the exception of the parts making up the epilogue 55:6-13, the relationship between units is not kerygmatic.

---

[70] Cf. Chapter IV, pp. 211-213.

[71] 52:4-12 were not analyzed above.

C. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The purpose of this inquiry has been to penetrate the structure of Deutero-Isaiah. We asked first whether it is a long, planned poetic composition or a group of short utterances later collected. Form critical research convinced us of the latter. After we had decided that, we asked whether the collector arranged the speeches in such a way that continuity in message occurs. In answer to this question we discovered that some connections are kerygmatic and some are not. But the kerygmatic relations, so we argued, appear only occasionally. Indeed, the framework itself--the Jacob-Israel, Zion-Jerusalem, and covenant blocks (40:12-48:21; 49:14-52:12; 54:1-55:13)--does not reflect a continuous progression in the message of the collection. Our inability to find a kerygmatic relationship between 40:1-8 and vv. 9-11 indicates that the framework does not rest on a kerygmatic progression. Moreover, in the fleshing out of the framework we have discovered that non-kerygmatic connections occur most often.

These conclusions are of course somewhat tentative. The fact that many speeches, particularly the Servant Songs, were not discussed here leaves open-ended possibilities for expansion on the conclusions reached in this inquiry. But we have, I hope, shaped to some degree the direction of future discussion. If my views are correct, discussion of Deutero-Isaiah's theology cannot proceed on the basis of the structure of the book, for that structure is not kerygmatic. Nor is it possible, I think, to speak of the message of the collector, except in the most limited sense. He organized the prophet's utterances into definite patterns, but only in isolated instances did he provide continuity in meaning. Another implication of the research performed here is that the problem of the Servant Songs remains wide open. The fact that Isaiah 40-55 is a collection allows on the one hand the possibility that these Songs were uttered by the prophet and included in the collection for that reason; on the other hand, our conclusion would not rule out the possibility that the work of a disciple with a somewhat different point of view was incorporated at the time of collection. Moreover, the question whether the Servant Songs were a part of the original collection or added after that collection was made remains to be solved. But the question should proceed on the assumption that Isaiah 40-55 is a collection of originally separate utterances.

---

[72] Chapter IV, pp. 224-225.

Our view that the Deutero-Isaianic corpus is not organized on kerygmatic principles may seem to reduce the scope within which we may continue the discussion of the prophet's message. In a sense this is true, but we should welcome restraint against saying more about the prophet's message than we ought. And, if we dare hope that a loss might have its compensations, we might count it a gain, in viewing these chapters as a collection of originally unrelated utterances, to be led to pay closer attention to the individual speeches in which we find reflected a prophet struggling in particular circumstances to speak to his people.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Burrows, M., ed. The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. I. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950.

Falkenstein, A. and W. von Soden, ed. Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebete. Zuerich and Stuttgart: Artemis-Verlag, 1953.

Kittel, R., ed. Biblica Hebraica. 7th. ed.; Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1951.

Pritchard, J.B., ed. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. 2nd. ed.; Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1955.

Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum graecum. Ed., Sociatatis Litterarum Gottingensis; Vol. XIV; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1939.

B. Books and Monographs

Baltzer, K. Das Bundesformular. 2nd. ed.; WMANT 4; Neukirchen, Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964.

Begrich, J. Studien zu Deuterojesaja. BWANT, 4 Folge, Heft 25 (77); Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938.

Boecker, H.J. Redeformen des Rechtslebens im alten Testament. WMANT 14; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964.

Childs, B.S. Memory and Tradition in Israel. SBT 37; London: S.C.M. Press, 1962.

Cowley, A. Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. Oxford University Press, 1923.

Elliger, K. Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhaeltnis zu Tritojesaja. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.

Fohrer, G. *Elia*, *ATANT* 31; Zuerich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1957.

Gressmann, H. *Israels Spruchweisheit*. Berlin: Karl Curtius, 1925.

Gunkel, H. *Einleitung in die Psalmen*. 2nd. ed.; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966.

__________. *Elias, Jahve, und Baal*. Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1906.

Koehler, L. *Deuterojesaja stilkritisch untersucht*. Giessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1923.

Labuschagne, C.J. *The Incomparability of Yahweh in the Old Testament*. *Pretoria Oriental Series*, Vol. V; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1966.

McCarthy, D.J. *Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament*. *Analecta Biblica* 21; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.

Mendenhall, G. *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Pittsburgh: The Presbyterian Board of Colportage of Western Pennsylvania, 1955.

Mowinckel, S. *The Psalma in Israel's Worship*. Trans. by D.R. Ap-Thomas. 2 vols.; New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Norden, E. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religioeser Rede*. Leipzig and Berlin: B.G. Teubner, 1913.

von Rad, G. *Old Testament Theology*. Trans. by D.M.G. Stalker. 2 vols.; Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965.

Smith, S. *Isaiah Chapters XL-LV: Literary Criticism and History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1940, 1944.

von Waldow, E. *Der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der prophetischen Gerichtsreden*. *BZAW* 85; Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann, 1963.

Westermann, C. *Das Loben Gottes in den Psalmen*. 3rd. ed.; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963.

__________. Sprache und Struktur der Prophetie Deuterojesajas. Forschung am alten Testament. Theologische Buecherei, Band 24; Muenchen: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1964, pp. 92-170.

Zimmerli, W. Erkenntnis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezechiel. ATANT 27; Zuerich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1954.

C. Commentaries

Duhm, B. Das Buch Jesaia uebersetzt und erklaert. 4th. ed.; HKAT 3/1; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1922.

Fohrer, G. Das Buch Jesaja. Zuercher Bibelkommentare; 3 vols.; Zuerich and Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1964.

Gressmann, H. Die aelteste Geschichtsschreibung und die Prophetie Israels. SAT 2/1; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910.

Haller, M. Das Judentum. 2nd. ed., revised; SAT 2/3; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1925.

Kissane, E.J. The Book of Isaiah. 2 vols.; Dublin: The Richview Press, 1943.

Knight, G.A.F. Deutero-Isaiah: A Theological Commentary on Isaiah 40-55. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.

Muilenburg, J. The Interpreter's Bible. Ed., George Arthur Buttrick; Vol. V; New York: Abingdon Press, 1956, pp. 381ff.

Pope, M.H. Job. The Anchor Bible, Vol. XV; Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1965.

Schmidt, H. Die grossen Propheten, mit Einleitungen versehen von H. Gunkel. SAT 2/2; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1915.

Torrey, C.C. The Second Isaiah. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.

Volz, P. Jesaja II uebersetzt und erklaert. KAT 9; Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1932.

Westermann, C. Das Buch Jesaja: Kapitel 40-66. ATD, Teilband 19; Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966.

Zimmerli, W. *Ezechiel. BK* 13; Neukirchen, Kreis Moers: Neukirchen Verlag, 1956-.

D. Dissertations

Hessler, E. *Gott der Schoepfer: Ein Beitrag zur Komposition und Theologie Deuterojesajas*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ernst Moritz Arndt-Universitaet at Greifswald, 1961.

von Waldow, E. *Anlass und Hintergrund der Verkuendigung des Deuterojesaja.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rheinischen Friedrich Wilhelms-Universitaet at Bonn, 1953.

E. Articles

Alt, A. "Das Gottesurteil auf dem Karmel," *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel.* 2nd. ed.; 3 vols.; Muenchen: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1964, pp. 135-149.

Begrich, J. "Das priesterliche Heilsorakel," *ZAW* 52 (1934), pp. 81-92.

______. "Die priesterliche Tora," *BZAW* 66. Berlin: Alfred Toepelmann, 1936, pp. 63-88.

Dion, H.M. "The 'Oracle of Salvation,'" *CBQ* 29 (1967), pp. 198-206.

Driver, G.R. "Notes on Isaiah," *BZAW* 77 (1958), pp. 47-48.

Gerstenberger, E. "Covenant and Commandment," *JBL* 84 (1965), pp. 38-51.

Gressmann, H. "Die literarische Analyse Deuterojesajas," *ZAW* 34 (1914), pp. 254-297.

Gunkel, H. "Propheten Israels seit Amos," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. 2nd. ed.; Ed., Hermann Gunkel and Leopold Zscharnack; Vol. IV; Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1930, pp. 1538-1554.

Harvey, J. "Le 'Rîb-pattern,' requisitoire prophétique sur la rupture d'alliance," *Biblica* 43 (1962), pp. 172-196.

Huffmon, H. "The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets," JBL 78 (1959), pp. 285-295.

Mowinckel, S. "Die Komposition des deuterojesajanischen Buches," ZAW 49 (1931), pp. 87-112, 242-260.

von Rad, G. "Job XXXVIII and Egyptian Wisdom," The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Trans. by E. W. Trueman Dicken; Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965.

Westermann, C. "Das Heilswort bei Deuterojesaja," EvTh 24 (1964), pp. 355-373.

Williams, R.J. "The Fable in the Ancient Near East," A Stubborn Faith. Ed., Edward C. Hobbs; Dallas: SMU Press, 1956.

Wright, G.E. "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32," Israel's Prophetic Heritage. Ed., Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962, pp. 26-67.

Wuerthwein, E. "Die Erzaehlung vom Gottesurteil auf dem Karmel," ZThK 59 (1962), pp. 131-144.

__________. "Die Ursprung der prophetischen Gerichtsrede," ZThK 49 (1952), pp. 1-16.

Zimmerli, W. "Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel," ZAW 66 (1954), pp. 1-26.

_______. "Ich bin Jahwe," Geschichte und Altes Testament. Beitraege zur historischen Theologie, Band 16; Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953.

_______. "Zur Sprache Tritojesajas," Festschrift fuer Ludwig Koehler. Bern: Buechler und Co., 1950, pp. 62-74.